



The ARYAN PATH

No. 8.

AUGUST 1930

Vol. I.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE APPROACH TO THE PATH	481
THE PATHS OF INDIA, CHINA AND THE WEST— By J. W. T. Mason	484
LET BUDDHA INSPIRE THE WEST!—By Kazutomo Takahashi ..	490
LOOKING TOWARDS 1975—By J. D. Beresford	495
THE ETERNAL MOVEMENT—By Prajnanda	501
PARABRAHMAN, THE ABSOLUTE: IN EUROPEAN PHILOSOPHY— By G. R. Malkani	503
MEDIUMS AND MEDIUMISM	515
WHO, WHERE AND WHAT IS GOD?—By B. M.	519
REINCARNATION AND MEMORY—By Vera Grayson	521
THE FESTIVAL OF SERPENTS—By N. Kasturi Iyer	522
FROM PARIS—M. Dugard	525
IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS—By H. D. Sethna, Edith Ward, H. S. Redgrove and others	529
CORRESPONDENCE	536
ENDS & SAYINGS	540

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA), LTD.,
51, Esplanade Road, - - BOMBAY, INDIA.

THE ARYAN PATH

ADDRESS :

51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, India.



PUBLISHERS :—Theosophy Co. (India), Ltd.

SUBSCRIPTIONS :—No subscriptions are accepted for less than one full year of twelve numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single and back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price : In India, single copy Re. 1, per annum Rs. 10. In Europe, single copy 2s. 6d., per annum £1 or equivalent ; in America, single copy 50 cents, per annum \$5 ; post free.

CONTRIBUTIONS :—Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten, on one side of the paper only, with wide margin, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE :—Letters from subscribers and readers are welcome, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the Magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of THE ARYAN PATH.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS :—Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine, when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts direct to **Theosophy Co. (India), Ltd.,** 51, Esplanade Road, Bombay, which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are :—

- (a) To form a nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour ;
- (b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and a demonstration of the importance of such study ; and
- (c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.



Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. I.

AUGUST, 1930.

No. 8

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles only. They are not necessarily in agreement with the views of their contributors to whom they leave free expression of opinion.

THE APPROACH TO THE PATH.

A correspondent of *The Times* (London) reflecting upon the Whitsunday Myth of the followers of the Ascended Christ receiving a new life, writes an article which, shorn of its conservative creedal wording, is Theosophical in spirit. His theme is the Paraclete—the Comforter and Advocate—promised by Jesus to his followers as a parting gift. They were despondent and did not know where to look for help and guidance when the Teacher departed. “They needed no less an Advocate” ; they desired a pillar to lean upon as strong as Jesus himself ; they wished that to be an ever-present source of inspiration even as the Teacher was. In response Jesus offers them the Paraclete.

“Paraclete” is translated Comforter and Advocate ; he is defined as the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of Truth which would “abide with you for ever” ; he is described by the writer of the article as “the Divine Spirit who comes to defend against evil without and within, not as an external defender against attack, but as an inner activity of spiritual power in the recesses of life.”

The writer says that “it must always be hard to be a Christian,” and that this “promise of another advocate clearly implies that men can never find discipleship an easy matter.” But discipleship not being the sole privilege of the followers of Jesus, it is not only “hard to be a Christian” but equally hard to be a disciple of Gautama or Krishna, Zarathushtra or Lao Tzu. Every Guru has reiterated the teaching about the Paraclete ; this biblical concept is very old and universal.

Theosophy teaches that Jesus and his like come to mankind from age to age (as Krishna-Christ points out in the Gita IV.8) and in spite of all the inspiration and wisdom they shower upon their followers

and others, there is no spiritual hope for man save as he turns within for comfort in darkness and for advocacy in the performance of the deeds of light.

This view stands unveiled in its profundity when we consider the biblical assertion that it is expedient that Jesus should go away for then only the Comforter will come (John XVI. 7). It is not merely basking in the spiritual radiance of the Guru that confirms us in discipleship; it is the assimilation of his instruction and the absorption of his life, by osmosis and in other ways, which produces a change of heart, bestows a deeper perception and compels a different mode of life. How far this osmosis has taken place is best known when the Master becomes absent to the perception of the Chela, driving the latter to turn within for all guidance. This is one of the reasons why the Great Ones break the continuity of Their public work—labouring visibly, but mostly in secrecy, for twenty-five years in every century, and watching from Their occult world the doings of this world for the remaining seventy-five years.

In this ancient and universal teaching modern disciples and would-be disciples will find the approach to the Path of Discipleship, which is not reserved for any special caste or creed, but is open to the most untouchable of sinners.

What is that approach? That he shall turn within where is the true world of Spirit and note the existence of the Soul and find out its nature and ways. Not by any other member of our being but by the Soul, and the Soul alone, the world-process can be truly understood. Senses mislead, feelings becloud, mind itself proves abortive; Soul, and Soul alone, using all these, is capable of true perception.

The ordinary man views the drama of evolution by his senses; he enjoys it or is bored with it, centred in emotion; he criticises it by the analytical power of his mind; finally he chafes against its decrees and methods, or is dumbfounded before its meaning, or becomes superstitious about its mystery. How many observe the Play with the single eye of the Soul? Even when Great Ones appear on the stage to act Their lofty parts the spectator sees with the eyes of flesh and tries to fathom Their words with his clever mind.

History shows that every Teacher invariably proceeds to deliver his Message in three stages: Beginning with a dispassionate exposure of the wrong morale of the people to whom he comes, he proceeds to expound positive principles of life based on a clear understanding of the universal laws of nature, and then only, as a third step, he calls upon his hearers to look within. In other words, he says to the individual that his morale is wrong because he is centred in his senses and is moved by his passionate mind. Not till man finds his own Soul which is capable of moving the mind and mastering the passions and using the senses can he know what life is or its meaning, not till then is the pupil ready to comprehend the words of the teacher.

We cannot even know what is wrong with us till the admonisher within is found. The sayings of the Teacher remain parables till Soul and not senses becomes the hearer. Therefore the injunction to look within, and look from within—the one so that we may find ourselves, the second for the purpose of understanding the universe without. Senses make our illusory horizon; mind establishes our limited universe of discourse; but the Soul, boundless and beginningless, can see the vision of an infinite immortality. The Teacher present, his power energizes us to grasp some of this wisdom, to catch a glimpse of that infinite immortality; but unless our own power is evoked, his going away will deprive us of the inspiration of our vision. Therefore this particular message of every true Guru—to keep the link of Wisdom unbroken by holding fast to the Soul and going slow with the senses.

Holy Writ is profaned when mind tries to manipulate it; its holiness is assimilated when the soul uses it. It is in this sense that the puzzling occult teaching should be understood—"even ignorance is better than head-learning with no Soul-wisdom to illuminate and guide it." Head-learning puts us on a wrong track, and we have to retrace the steps taken by the light of head-learning; ignorance though weak is devoid of encumbrances.

Look within and look from within!

The higher life, however, does not consist in retirement from body and mind into a state of passivity, but in evoking the power of the Paraclete to behold the universe, to serve Mother Nature. But how to make sure that he who speaks and inspires is the Holy Ghost and not mere ghost, is Spirit and not spook, is Comforter and not soothsayer, is Advocate and not specious pleader? By the Light of Eternal Wisdom. The dying Buddha said (*Maha Parinibbana-Sutta* II.33; VI.1; and VI.10):

Be ye lamps unto yourselves. Hold fast to the Truth as a lamp. The truths set forth for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you. Work out your salvation with diligence.

THE PATHS OF INDIA, CHINA & THE WEST.

[J. W. T. Mason is an American writer on philosophy and religion. He has travelled extensively in many countries, studying religious and philosophical problems. He is a personal friend of Henri Bergson, to whose school of philosophy, in its creative sense, he belongs. Among other friends from whom he has gained philosophic insight, through personal contact, are Benedetto Croce, in Italy, and F. C. S. Schiller, at Oxford. Mr. Mason's first book on philosophy, *Creative Freedom* (1926), was commended by many critics as opening a new approach to the study of creative activity. His second book, *The Creative East*, published in 1928 in "The Wisdom of the East" series, is being used as a text book in philosophy at the College of the City of New York, and has been recommended as an essential volume for journalistic study by Dean Walter Williams, of the Missouri University School of Journalism. It has been translated into Japanese and is now being translated into Russian. Mr. Mason is vice-president of the recently formed New York Chapter of the International Philosophic Society, whose headquarters are at Leipzig, Germany, and whose purpose is to further international culture relations.

Our readers' attention is called to our editorial Note which follows this article.—EDS.]

Life includes its varied human activities in three major specializations, spirituality, æstheticism and utilitarianism. To co-ordinate the three, so that human personality can reach its highest development, is shown by experience to be very difficult. Almost always nations as well as individuals tend to emphasize one of the three at the expense of the others. If we regard human life as a movement working out its own destiny by its own efforts, then humanity's specializing tendency seems by no means abnormal. Humanity, regarded as a whole, specializes in its parts, and we know that the specialist reaches higher levels of attainment, in a shorter time, than the individual or nation that does no more than adopt what I may call only a casual interest in any of the three great movements of humanity. The objective which life appears to have as its aim is an eventual co-operation of spirituality, æstheticism and utilitarianism; but, the present phase of man's existence shows predominant signs of being still in the specialist's stage.

INDIA'S SPIRITUALITY.

India is the centre of humanity's spiritual specialization. Nowhere else has mankind so deeply concentrated on spiritual matters for so lengthy a period. India has attained heights of spiritual knowledge surpassing all other nations. But, it is pure spirituality. That is to say, it has little association with the practical concerns of material existence. India's nationalism is a spiritual and not a material nationalism. I make this assertion realizing that critics declare there are more religions in India than in the rest of the world.

But the soul is deeper than any religious formula. To say India is spiritual means far more than to say India is religious. The spiritual specialization of India has given Hinduism an insight into non-material

Reality which the rest of the world is gradually coming to accept, in its philosophy and in modern, occidental science. Fundamental Reality, as India's great thinkers long ago discovered, is not the material world but rests in immateriality. Henri Bergson, the West's leading philosopher of creative activity, moves toward the same understanding when he declares that the only way of knowing Reality is by intuitionism—by sinking ourselves below the surface of materiality and observing Reality in its innermost essence. Maine de Biran, the philosopher of the French Revolutionary period, to whom Bergson probably owes the basis of this idea, emphasized the necessity of penetrating through experience and taking inner observation as our guide to Reality. One might quote from many western philosophers to demonstrate other trends of ancient Hindu spirituality appearing in the ideas of modern occidental thinkers. William James accepted the principle of karma. Hægel doubtless took his idea of the world-soul from the unifying implication of Indian spiritual knowledge.

Furthermore, the most advanced western physicists and mathematicians are entirely revising old theories of science. Their new principles are new to the west, but so old to India that the origins have been lost. Thus, A. S. Eddington, the great expounder of relativity, at Cambridge University, in his book *The Nature of the Physical World*, declares (pp. 225, 228) that science surveys the world (that is, the universe) only by means of instruments which are part of the universe and thus being subject to its laws, give only partial results. He adds: "It has become doubtful whether it will ever be possible to construct a physical world solely out of the knowable. . . . It seems more likely that we must be content to admit a mixture of the knowable and unknowable."

The "unknowable" in physical terms, yes. But, India supplies the key to the physically unknowable by means of human thought transcending materiality and coming in touch with pure spirituality. Science, eventually, must recognize this fact, if ever science is to know Reality. Such has been India's contribution to human progress. But, the energy required for Hinduism's spiritual specialization has left little to be applied to æstheticism and utilitarianism. The spiritual concentration of India has tended to turn interest away from the conquest of matter. Karma, for instance, may be interpreted to include self-responsibility—but for what? For escaping from past devastating influences and refraining from injecting evil influences into the future. Self-responsibility is thus dominantly interpreted in spiritual terms. Self-responsibility, however, has also a utilitarian meaning. It means responsibility for improving one's material lot in life and carrying forward the great human movement of making matter submit to human welfare. India must develop an understanding of that interpretation of responsibility for her spiritual genius to co-ordinate itself with utilitarian betterment.

ÆSTHETICISM IN CHINA.

China has neglected spirituality and utilitarianism and has specialized far more than any other nation on æstheticism. The

Chinese have naturally a versatile temperament ; but they have subordinated other factors of life to concentration on an amazing development of æsthetic versatility.

Spirituality is debased in China. Materialism, so greatly desired by the present revolutionary leaders, has been buried for thousands of years, in any large creative sense, and resists every tendency towards resurrection. Why ? Because for ages past, the Chinese have found their deepest satisfactions in æsthetic enjoyment. They have an inventive turn of mind, which, however, soon loses itself in methods instead of persistently pursuing progressive ends.

The Way, Taoism, is far more æsthetic than spiritual, in its influence. The way of doing is much more important than accomplishment. That is the fundamental of æstheticism, which always seeks to symbolize creativeness as a power apart from the created thing. To express an argument elegantly is more satisfying to the Chinese mind than to neglect the niceties of language for a material end. To be properly attired, for any occasion, in ceremonious manner, is more pleasing than to give one's energy to the mental discipline necessary for practical reforms.

Chinese art has amazed western critics by the subtlety of its symbolism and its meanings and its display of intuitive knowledge of form and design. No less is a similar æsthetic passion shown in all of life's relations, in writing, in speaking, in the way of performing one's duties. To accept an offered price from a Chinese merchant, for any object, is often to rouse his contempt. That is not because he may regard the purchaser as a poor judge of values. It is because the merchant considers the purchaser somewhat as a "barbarian" because he has neglected an opportunity to engage in a delicate and refined discussion of what the price ought to be. That is to say, the method of arriving at the price is the important thing ; and the method must be a debate, between seller and purchaser, containing subtleties of verbal discourse which are enjoyed for their own sake.

With such an insistence upon the part æstheticism must play in the practical affairs of life, the Chinese have been content for generation after generation. It has fascinated not only the Chinese but also their various "conquerors." However active and "barbaric" have been the past invaders of China, they have all surrendered in time to the æsthetic complex. Now and again, at very rare intervals, a great materialistic genius has arisen in China, but his sway has been shortlived. He has not been able to make a lasting impression. The nation has developed highly skilled merchants : but, merchants are traders, they are the middle men, not creative utilitarians. They do not create factories and mills, nor invent the complicated machines which utilitarianism requires for its expansion. The merchant, indeed, is more successful as he is the more æsthetic, even in the west. He must display his goods and entice and please his customers by delicacies of tact and insinuation. When he comes in direct contact with his customers, he succeeds or fails in large measure, proportionate to his æsthetic competence, in conjunction, of course, with the customer's capacity to respond to æstheticism.

In China, the æsthetic spirit is so all-pervading that success is impossible without it. One sees a demonstration of this fact in the unsuccessful efforts of so many recent leaders to unite the nation, under the present revolutionary impetus. He who reaches the top must stop to measure his future movements. He must neglect accomplishment for "face saving," which is no more than æsthetically respecting the feelings of others. So, practical results are enmeshed in a complicated methodology and China to-day is as she is.

THE UTILITARIAN WEST.

Occidental culture is fundamentally utilitarian. The western soul has struggled for century after century to express itself in terms of material accomplishment. Matter has been regarded as an incitement to utility. To seize matter, to come to grips with it, to devise ways of forcing it to obey man's desire for making the earth his seat of creative power—this has incited persistently the interest of man in his occidental evolution.

Western man has struggled to emancipate his soul not from material desires, but from the control of other men. In doing so, the purpose has been to develop individuality, for freedom to progress in terms of materialistic creative activity. Political liberty in the west has been no gift of the gods. It has not resulted from a policy of spiritual appeal, nor yet from consideration of æsthetic refinement. Political liberty has been won through the impetus of utilitarianism. When, as in Britain, monarchs had exhausted their treasuries and required help, they were compelled to turn to the thrifty utilitarians—to the merchants and the guilds of craftsmen—and in exchange for funds, the people received increasing measures of autonomous government and individual rights. Political power of the western masses grew as their industrial power increased.

The basic tendency of progress to-day in the United States is interpreted materialistically. Improvement of the lot of the workers is stimulated because it leads to larger capacities for utilitarian accomplishment in which all share. Slavery was abolished in the west only because man had found how to make material machines that could produce more than slave labour. Were the utilitarian skill of the west suddenly to degenerate, undoubtedly slavery and serfdom would return. Life will ever have machine labour, and will use human machines if man does not develop the competence to make better machines out of matter.

But the western utilitarian movement, however much it has led to political freedom and to material advancement, has caused the occident to neglect spirituality and æstheticism. Churches, priest-hoods and creeds abound in the west. But where is there an occidental subtlety of spiritual intuition in any way comparable to the long period of development of inner knowledge of Reality which Hinduism shows? One must search western sacred books and western philosophy as well, with the minutest care, to find even a suggestion of the profound

understanding of Reality which Indian spiritual seers have advanced with details which western science is now substantiating. The Ego dominates western spirituality not the All.

Too, the west shows but a crude understanding of æsthetics when one places occidental refinements beside the Chinese. Painting and sculpture and literary style and other art symbolism in material form are to be found in the west. But, art as living reality, æstheticism as a normal, natural way of meeting the problems of existence, such as China shows, cannot be understood by the western mind, much less applied to western culture. The west interprets most of the meanings of life in material terms; and so its specialization has resulted in higher utilitarian progress than the orient, where spirituality and æstheticism have originated and still dominate.

Does the fact that life seems to have specialized in these separate fashions in east and west mean that there is a unifying principle which eventually may unite eastern and western thought? Unification in that sense is a dangerous word. Life does show that its higher realization seems dependent on co-ordination of spirituality, æstheticism and utilitarianism. Each specialized development, too, can instruct others, less specialized, in what may be accomplished. But, to believe that east and west have only to exchange their knowledge in order to bring harmony into the world is to see life as mechanistic. Life moves forward as though it were self-creating its own progress, not in any one path but in many ways. Creative activity is not confined to a single direction.

India, dominated by spirituality, can no more plant western ways of utilitarianism in her national life than the west can take over Hinduism, or than China can create a hybrid culture of Indian spirituality and western utilitarianism forced to amalgamate with her own æstheticism. Life never repeats itself that way. Life, however, is adaptable. But adaptability is always fatal if it is carried too far. The old must be preserved in all that is its best, while the new is given a chance to evolve. Otherwise, destruction results.

India, adapting utilitarianism and æstheticism to her life, will have her own differences just as the west, seeking spirituality and æstheticism, and China absorbing utilitarianism and spirituality, must evolve their own unique results. Life wants versatility, not a mechanical sameness. There are many ways whereby spirituality, æstheticism and utilitarianism can be co-ordinated. But, fundamentally, India, China and the occident have shown the basic properties of these specializations. Human progress, in its widest sense, depends on how far all of us take inspiration from the world's three centres of specialized progress. Not, however, taking blindly; but, in accordance with each nation's own creative spirit and own intent to develop originality and initiative, so that the versatility of the world spirit shall endure.

J. W. T. MASON.

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE.

The three modes of life-expression which, according to Mr. Mason, are specialized in India, China and the West respectively spring from the three basic qualities of the human soul or self-consciousness, *viz.*, Gnyan, Ichchha, and Kriya, the power to know LIFE, the aspiration to feel LIFE, and the strength to manifest LIFE. In Indian philosophical literature the three ways are well known as those of knowledge, devotion and works. These correspond to the realization of the true, the beautiful and the good which the Greeks advocated.

It is true that in groping towards the Light, the human soul readily and easily takes a special way, particularly in this age of specialists! But such soul treatises as the *Gita* emphasise the fact that the ways are not three but one and that is a triple way. Now, races of men differ in spiritual gifts and expressions; racial and national Karma overtaking the individual human soul pull him away from an all-round progress; the human soul wearing an Indian body forgets his own inherent nature and identifying itself with racial and national atmosphere calls itself Indian; so in China; so in the Occident.

Every true spiritual Teacher like Krishna, or Lao Tsu, tries to awaken the recognition of the soul to its own impersonal, non-sectarian, non-communal nature. In spite of this repeated cyclic effort and impact from the Lodge of Pure Cosmopolitans men tend towards the personal, for the other "is with difficulty attained by corporeal beings." Thus India is more spiritual and less æsthetic and utilitarian in spite of the *Gita*, the Upanishads, and the words and works of the divine Buddha; this is equally true, *mutatis mutandis*, of China and the Occident.

Real human progress lies along the impersonal path, *i.e.*, in an all-round culture of the whole soul; Europe and America cannot gain spirituality from India by any vicarious process, any more than India can learn the ways of utility by copying the West. The Westerner as the Easterner is a human soul; he need not go East or West in search of Wisdom; he must turn within—on the north pole of his brain he will obtain knowledge; in the east of his heart he will find the City of the Lord—Vishnupuram; when harmonious communication is established between brain and heart he will participate in the sacrifice which is active in the whole of Nature, and for which really his strong arms, supple hands and deft fingers are fashioned.

Spiritual Integrity, of which Mr. Middleton Murry wrote in our May number (p. 293) can be fully maintained not only by our rising above the distinctions of caste, creed and community, but by an inner recognition that to learn, to love, and to labour are the triple birth-right of the Soul.

LET BUDDHA INSPIRE THE WEST !

[**Kazutomo Takahashi** was formerly a Professor of English in Keio University ; also at one time he was Editor of *The Japan Times*.

The only comment we would like to make in printing Mr. Takahashi's article, which we do with great and peculiar pleasure, is in reference to his claim that Christianity, Mohammedanism, Confucianism, and all other religions, in one way or other, are all branches or different schools of Buddhism. In this we must distinguish between the Dharma of the Buddhas, who preceded Gautama and which the Enlightened One once again taught, and the popular Buddhist religion as practised to-day. While it is true that of all the existing creeds Buddhism is the least corrupted, as also the least marred by the evil hand of the priest, even it has not remained entirely free from the effects of concretization and anthropomorphization.—Eds.]

If not possessed of the vicarious significance of the tragedy of the Cross, the story of Sakyamuni the Buddha has nothing approaching it in most other respects, especially in its supremely humane and dramatic aspect, to begin with, and its unswerving human tone throughout. What other prophet is there who fought so nobly, so courageously, withal so beautifully, all the weaknesses that the flesh is heir to, and conquered all, including the demons of doubt and fear, so completely as the teacher of Nirvana and the Law ?

A pensive but bright boy, brilliant in learning and most adroit at all arts of defence and offence, Prince Shiddhartha of Kapilavastu in the modern state of Nepal grew up and at the age of nineteen married a beautiful Princess of his own choice. He was the happiest of young men then living (6th century B.C.), with all worldly joys and pleasures at his feet, his royal parent being only too anxious to make him ever more happy. But his pensiveness went on deepening, and he was seized with a fervent desire to know the why of all the miseries in the world, and to penetrate the mysteries of life and death.

At the age of twenty-nine, after his young wife had presented him with a little son, and when he was at the height of glory as the heir-apparent to the throne, when power, wealth, and the reins of a great empire were within his reach—Shiddhartha, one night, stole out of his palace, and went into a forest, with his heart torn to shreds in a struggle between a resolution to conquer the most profound secret, out of measureless compassion for his fellow beings, and the beckoning power to win him back to the sweet ties of hearth and home. His adamant resolution triumphed over all, and for years he lived the stern life of a mendicant, begging his food while not fasting, doing penance while not engaged in abstract contemplation.

One must not forget that it is this chapter of Shiddhartha's life, which is almost as powerful in winning the hearts of men as the most abstruse of his philosophy that disarms criticism and argument. The world knows innumerable instances of noble sacrificing of life under the pressure of necessity, of almost superhuman fortitude at the call

of duty, of dare-devil courage at the dictate of egregious vaingloriousness, or of godly resignation from a sense of martyrdom. But the deliberate and self-imposed renunciation of all that is most dear to the heart and most difficult to surrender, like Shiddhartha's, sheerly out of sympathy and solicitude for the good of his fellowmen, finds no equal in the history of mankind.

Shiddhartha's struggle of years for Enlightenment, armed only with an ascetic life and negative, non-constructive contemplation, had reduced him to a mere skeleton, weak in body and beclouded in mind, well nigh unto death, with the solution of his problems as far off as ever. He awoke then to the folly of blind self-denial as if that and that alone was the high road to Light, and a thought dawned on him that there could be no right thinking except in a healthy mind and healthy body. Then he allowed himself to be fed and strove to recover his bodily strength.

Fresh and vigorous in mind, hale and enduring in body, Shiddhartha once more sat himself on a stone under the Bodhi tree, and began to think constructively. The word "constructive" seems warrantable here ; for it is assumable that, this time, he drew on all the knowledge of science, art and literature which he had acquired during the first twenty-nine years of his life as a careful, searching and extra-bright student. It may be noted in this connection that there is a popular but very nonsensical notion about the practice of Dhyana, it being represented as a sheer act of contemplation, abstraction, and self-denial. According to this notion, the killing of thoughts and appetites will reveal Light, which is an arrant superstition. Behold ! Shiddhartha himself failed in his purpose in his ascetic contemplation, and had to restart his study with his body properly nourished and his mind alert to all phenomena around, as his preaching after Enlightenment unmistakably indicates. What Dhyana enjoins is the abatement and banishment of prejudices, prejudgments, and preoccupations, and the keeping the mind perfectly open to all facts, not to miss even the most insignificant, all which is the most difficult thing for most minds to undertake. This is true Dhyana, and there can be no question that it was what Shiddhartha went through in his second battle with his problems, keeping his mind absolutely void of all that was illusory and delusive, while marshalling his facts in the most efficient order.

At daybreak of the 8th day of the month of February of his thirty-fifth year, all clouds of doubt and misgivings cleared, and Enlightenment burst upon Shiddhartha like the sun that was then rising. He arose the Buddha ! The legend of Shiddhartha's birth, that on coming out of his mother's side, he walked seven steps forward and seven steps backward, and pointing towards the heaven with one hand, and towards the earth with the other, he declared himself the only great and holy one, seems to fit in well with the occasion of his regeneration as the Buddha. However this may be, suffice it to say that the most important point in this second chapter of his life is his discovery of the mistake in the way of seeking the truth, and the alacrity with which he turned to the right course. This offers a great

lesson to those who take any interest in Buddhism, as also to non-believers. There must have been hundreds of thousands who had before, or have after, Shiddhartha, gone in for asceticism and abstraction, alas, all in vain, just because they were not able to lift themselves out of the old ruts as did Shiddhartha.

Sakyamuni the Buddha's preaching of forty-five years, which constitutes his philosophy, and to which he took as soon as he mastered the mysteries of his problems, includes not only all phases of human life, but also a cosmology of its own, as well as a spiritualism in its proper sense, systems of logic, medical science, ethics, rationalization, and a metaphysics of life and death. He develops his ideas intuitively rather than empirically and inductively, poetically rather than prosaically and logically, and with sure conviction rather than with halting scepticism; but his philosophy is self-consistent and rational, all charges of self-contradiction, the disregard of scientific truths, and of fanciful vagaries, being generally found to arise from the imperfect grasp of his teaching.

The Buddha's philosophy woven into a system of ethico-spiritual teaching is, it may be said, Buddhism, and Buddhism is the most comprehensive of religions. Christianity, Mohammedanism, Confucianism, and all other religions are, in so far as they aspire to show the way to salvation, under one name or another, all branches or different schools of Buddhism; for Buddhism is capacious enough to receive and digest everything that teaches to seek the truth, which is another way of saying "leading to salvation". The door of Buddhism is open to all religions and to everybody. Exclusiveness and discrimination are things unknown to Buddhism.

The difference—if difference it may be called—between what is commonly called philosophy and Buddhism, is that, whereas the former essays to explain away things, the world of man, the universe, Buddhism lays it down that the Great Truth is statically the whole universe, and dynamically the phenomena of changes, which are a sort of ethereal waves, so to speak, like colours when seen, or like electric waves when unseen. To tell this in modern language, the Truth is like a white light, into which prismatic colours dissolve, and the changes are like colours or the waves of electricity.

The Buddha speaks constantly of the Truth; but he never explains what it is. He no doubt knows himself what it is; perhaps he considers it beyond human faculty in the unenlightened stage to see and understand, that is, except intuitively after immense thinking such as Shiddhartha himself went through. But his silence on the nature and essence of the Great Truth no more vitiates his philosophy than the unknownness of the force of electricity undoes the science of electricity, light or colour. One knows that colour is a change of light, and light a change of electricity; but that explains nothing, though one knows further that beyond electricity is Life. The Buddha teaches that his philosophy of Truth accounts for all the phenomena of the human world, just as the theory of colour light, electricity, and force explain

all the visible phenomena of nature. It is not to be doubted that light, electricity, force, and the Truth will become all a matter of concrete knowledge to one as soon as one attains Buddhahood.

The Buddha teaches that the dynamic of the Great Truth is Life, which is All One, even as colour is the phenomenon of white light, and the force that turns the Great Truth into Life he calls the Great Wheel. All the phenomena of Life are the work of the Great Wheel. When all the phenomena of Life are resolved into a white light, so to speak, the Great Wheel will have run its course, and the Life becomes one with the Great Truth and attains Nirvana. Colours are really the expressions of the sorrow of separation from the white light. Similarly there is suffering as long as the Great Wheel is at work, separating Life from the Great Truth. But even as men, not knowing the suffering which separation causes, take delight in colours, so they, through delusion and illusion, realize not the reality of the sufferings of Life, and the Buddha in his all-wisdom and fathomless compassion seeks to free them from the sufferings and lead them to Great Emancipation, Supreme Enlightenment, Nirvana.

In order that men and women might be enabled to concentrate their minds upon and see the better where and how to avoid these illusions and delusions, the Buddha symbolizes them into different divinities and heavens, worlds, and hells. When the Buddhists worship their deities, they do so to think out the surest way to escape some particular evils or failings ; for the Buddha says, think and only think, and you will find deliverance. This worshipping of symbolized divinities is the Buddhist religion, which is none other than a *popularised* philosophy of the Buddha.

In Japan Buddhism, which was imported some fourteen centuries ago as an established religion with its magnificent pantheon and grand hierarchy, has since passed through various stages of development, but always exerting its influence as a promoter of civilization and a mollifier of the human heart. It is true that there was a time when Buddhism became a mere matter of taste as it were, and temple building a fad among the great and rich. Then it had its days of armed warfare in the priesthood, and also of its degradation into gross idolatry. These latter phases were however no fault of Buddhism, but the work of priestcraft, which paints black chapters in the history of all religions in all countries, and no more need be said on this phase of the subject, except as regards the question of idolatry, on which a word may not be amiss.

Christianity denounces idol worshipping as profane and reprehensible, and consequently it is almost a second nature among the Westerners, be they Christians or non-Christians, to look upon idolatry as something debasing, contemptible, and loathsome. But which man is the more degraded : one who is intellectually independent, but morally a slave of pleasures carnal, incorporeal, or whimsical, and often lazy and dishonest, or one who is of strict integrity, diligent, earnest, reliable, and conscientious, though "superstitious, and given to bowing before idols"? Let it be noted that there is any amount of

superstition and idol worshipping in fact, if not in name, among men who take pride in being scientific and independent in thought, this being especially the case in such sciences as politics, economics, morality, and so on. Likewise there is everywhere a rank superstition about the superstitious, in taking it for granted that the superstitious are always malicious, full of falsehood, and even cruel and wicked.

I do not mean, and still less have I any desire, to advocate idolatry, but in fairness I hold that nothing can be more unjust than habitually to associate moral delinquency with the religiously superstitious. None but the superstitiously superstitious can be blind to the fact there are any number of men and women who are "hopelessly idolatrous," and yet absolutely flawless in moral probity, industriousness, conscientiousness, and fidelity. If, indeed, one pauses to be fair-minded and unprejudiced, one discovers that there is more honesty, reliability, and other sterling qualities in the "superstitious" than among those who put on airs of higher intelligence and superior culture. I have an idea that the Buddha would, in his all-compassion and tolerance, countenance idolatry on the part of those to whom the symbolism of the deified images is beyond their comprehension, and who must have something concrete to pin their faith on, to be righteous, and to do good. *He would far rather prefer honest idolaters to the pseudo-enlightened sophists and self-styled intelligentzia.*

Strip Buddhism of its legends, traditions and history, and there remains solely Shiddhartha, Prince of Nepal, who with his sublimely moving story of renunciation, which irresistibly melts the hardest of hearts, sets an example of thinking to the last, and the Buddha, into whom Shiddhartha had turned, with his immortal philosophy of inexhaustible interest which thinking reveals. I have read with extreme interest an article entitled "What Eastern Religion has to Offer to Western Civilization" in the January issue of THE ARYAN PATH, in which Mr. C. E. M. Joad points out that the Western civilization is at an impasse, with its illusions and ever changing insatiable appetites, and opines in conclusion: "The gift of contentment is, therefore, the chief gift which the East has to offer to the West, and this gift can only be received by those who have recovered the conviction of the fundamental worth-whileness of things." I may be permitted to suggest that contentment is always the result of stopping to think. One has to stop to think to be convinced of "the fundamental worth-whileness of things." What a world of revelation one will have, if only one stops to think. The rich American, of whom Mr. Joad speaks, will surely be cured of his "perpetual itching" for something new and pleasing, if he only stops to think. Buddhism is essentially a religion that exhorts all to stop to think, and fails not to bring salvation to those who stop to think.

KAZUTOMO TAKAHASHI.

LOOKING TOWARDS 1975.

[J. D. Beresford writes on a subject of more than ordinary interest to all Theosophists. His approach to his theme is somewhat unfortunate: he introduces the note of uniqueness regarding Akhnaton, and Nature abhors uniqueness in Egypt as in Palestine, in 1400 B.C. as in 1 A.D.]

Theosophical teaching on Mr. Beresford's theme is unequivocal. H. P. Blavatsky, to whom the article refers, has definitely stated that "no Master of Wisdom will Himself appear or send anyone to Europe or America until the year 1975." In accordance with cyclic law, between 1975 and 2000 A.D., an effort will again be made to teach the world. For the guidance of our readers we append an extract from her pen as an after-note to this article.—Eds.]

I had an opportunity recently of meeting in London one on whose behalf certain large claims have been made, and who is believed to be inspired with the message that shall presently initiate a new era in the religious thought of the world. That I personally was disappointed in that interview is a fact that has neither weight nor cogency. The individual reaction furnishes no test in this connection. But one result of this meeting is that I have found my mind constantly engaged with the thought of what is to me the most profoundly moving possibility in the future of mankind,—the return of the Great Soul for whom the world has found so many names.

One of these, the earliest of whom we have anything more than a traditional record, will not be found in any hagiology. But if we may assume, as I do, that he was truly inspired, that his astoundingly revolutionary ideals were not, could hardly indeed have been, the consequence of merely logical thinking, it may be worth while to reflect briefly on the circumstances and method relating to what may have been the first great message given to the present race of mankind.

The agent in this case was not a humble individual, but a man able to wield immense temporal power and born to a position and to wealth far exceeding that of Gautama. Moreover, this Egyptian Pharaoh made no great renunciation. He did not so much preach his new doctrine as impose it upon a people by a mandate against which there was no appeal.

He was crowned as Amenhotep IV, but in the course of his unprecedented endeavour to change the religion of a nation from Polytheism to Monotheism by a royal decree, he assumed the name of Ikhnaton, or, as it is more often spelt, Akhnaton. He appears to have succeeded to the throne at a very early age, to have reigned seventeen years, and to have died before he was thirty, in approximately 1358 B.C. And we may fairly assume in his case that there could have been no human mentor capable of begetting in him the astonishingly revolutionary teaching that he put forth in his last years. (If he had, if there were some human origin of which no record remains, some holy man of ascetic life who exerted a powerful influence upon the boy king, then the credit and honour may equally well be paid to this unknown

founder of the ethical principles that are still accepted as the gospel of right-living. But on the evidence it is infinitely more probable that the inspiration was vouchsafed directly to Ikhnaton himself. He was, we gather, physically weak; but he must have had a fine spiritual courage).

Ikhnaton, unlike the great teachers who succeeded him, did not, as I have implied, despise worldly honours. It is true that he set an unprecedented example, in that high office of his, of family life and love. But he used his power as Pharaoh—a power greater perhaps than the monarchs of any other civilization have been able to exercise solely by virtue of their kingship—to enforce a new religion and morality upon an unwilling and unprepared people.

The symbol of his monotheism was the Sun (Aton), yet in some ways, this single God had attributes nearer to the conception taught by Gautama and Jesus, than to that of the Aryan Zoroaster whose message was delivered some three or four hundred years later. Ikhnaton, for instance, was a splendid pacifist. His creed did not sanction the making of war; and the world at large and even the temper of his own subjects being still wholly unready for such a doctrine, the Kingdom of Egypt was soon in imminent danger of losing its supremacy among contemporary civilisations. Beyond this, we find no such attribution of power to the evil principle, as that conferred on Ahriman by Zoroaster¹. Indeed, the general inference from the material at our command is that Ikhnaton's principles, if cruder in form, approximated fairly nearly in spirit to those of Christianity.

And yet this physical weakling in that early age of the world bravely imposed this startlingly iconoclastic doctrine upon his subjects. He deposed Amen,² expelled Osiris, and outlined an eschatology that must have seemed utterly incredible to those who had been educated in the highly complicated system of beliefs relative to the Souls of the dead taught at that time. Surely in no other country would such a king have been permitted to die in his bed.

Now as an experiment, if I may use the term, this first instance³ of direct religious inspiration is unique in that it was afforded to one who had and maintained immense temporal power by virtue of his

¹ Not by Zoroaster, as is evident from Yasna XLV-2, where the two forces are regarded as twin powers of Ahura-Mazda. Later, the doctrine was corrupted and carnalized.—EDS.

² No doubt Amenhotep IV was a strong religious reformer of about 1400 B.C. Like all others of this class he was iconoclastic as well as constructive; he attacked the cult of Amon; but Amon-worship was sun-worship in ancient days, which had become corrupted. Already a movement for reform existed which seems to have impressed and influenced the King; he popularized it and pushed its work.—EDS.

³ According to Indian traditions there is the example of Janaka, the Royal-Sage of Mithila, of the Solar Race, who, according to H. P. Blavatsky, "lived twenty generations before Janaka, the father of Sita, who was King of Videha." Also, let us not forget long lines of Divine Kings referred to by every old tradition, Chinese, Indian, Persian and Egyptian.—EDS.

office. Also, it was so far as we can judge a complete failure. On the succession of Ikhnaton's now so famous son-in-law, Tutankhamen, there was an instant and apparently complete reversion to the old gods, creeds and ethic, and no record remains of any disciple or evangelist carrying on the gospel of his master. Ikhnaton left nothing but a story, to arouse the interest and wonder of the thoughtful more than 3,000 years after his death.

I have dwelt at some length on what I suggest may be the first recorded instance of a deeply inspired religious teacher, not only because the case is so infrequently cited, but because it has, to my mind, a peculiar value from the fact that it was an "experiment" which was, apparently, nugatory. In succeeding cases, from Zoroaster onwards, the new gospel always took hold, and left its impress on later generations. Its teaching was embodied in sacred writings such as the Bible. And the intrinsic rightness of the ethical doctrine, not less than the sanction of the inspired teacher from whom it emanated, ensured its survival. In Ikhnaton's case no such sacred book survived although, broadly speaking, many of his principles seem to have anticipated those of Gautama.

If there is any lesson to be learnt from this instance of ancient Egypt, it is that the inspired teacher, however splendid his message, will leave little trace on the world unless there is a body of opinion ripe or nearly ripe to receive his teaching. In the case of Gautama, the ethical brotherhood which was founded by him and was the nucleus of the elaborate religion that presently emerged, was joined only by those who could appreciate the Buddha's wisdom. If Gautama or Jesus had lived in the Egypt of the fourteenth century B.C., it is possible that they might have achieved no more than Ikhnaton.

But what, to me, seems the most notable characteristic of religious feeling at the present time is just this urgent need and preparedness for another inspired messenger to give an impulse to the thought of the world. It is impossible to draw any analogy between the conditions prevailing now and those obtaining in, say, the sixth century B.C.; but it seems probable that the Hindu polytheism of that period does not indicate a preparedness for the Buddha such as that which I find in the thought of to-day. The difference, to my mind, resides chiefly in the fact that there is now, as there has never been before, a conscious apprehension of another great generative impulse. The anticipation of the coming of the Messiah whether among the Jews or the early Christians, is in no way comparable to this increasing belief that before the end of the present century¹, a new era of the world's history will be begun. And it is not comparable because whereas according to the old belief the Messiah was expected to confirm what was in effect no more than the faith of a particular sect, our present attitude is one of greater or less suspension. We do not look for confirmation, but for a new gospel that will at once embrace and transcend all the diverse

¹ See the Note appended to this article.—Eds.

faiths of humanity ; and this implies that it will contain a new element about which in our present ignorance it would be vain to speculate¹.

But if we cannot foresee the precise nature of the new teaching—for it is evident that a Great Teacher must always be something ahead even of the most advanced religious and ethical thought of his own time—we can hardly doubt that the basis of it will have some recognisable foreseeable elements.

One such element, in my opinion, will be the elimination of the principle of vicarious sacrifice. As a principle it may have served a useful purpose² during the past nineteen hundred years ; but the world is ready now to shoulder the burden of personal responsibility. Theosophy has prepared the way for the realisation that a man or a woman cannot escape the penalties of a vicious or carelessly selfish life either by a perfunctory subscription to a religious creed or by a tardy recognition of the symbol of the cross. Progress in the inner wisdom, in self-realisation, in the only process by which we can escape the wheel of suffering, can be won only by sustained effort. But I do not see that effort taking the old path of asceticism such as that practised by the Yogi or some of the early Christian saints. Personal asceticism there must be in so far as it implies a cultured disdain for all fleshly satisfactions, but it will not be won by separation from humanity³. In that relation, the world at large has yet to learn the wisdom of the female principle, conceived in the person of Kwan-Yin, who said “ Never will I seek nor receive private individual salvation. Never will I enter into final peace alone, but forever and everywhere will I live and strive for the redemption of every creature throughout the world.”

¹. It cannot be new : it will be age-old truths forgotten by our eras.—EDS.

². We disagree with our author : it is a pernicious doctrine and had no beneficent purpose to serve. The old doctrine of Karma, taught in the *Gita* and by the Buddha, and reiterated in pure Theosophy, is the true doctrine, and without its knowledge soul-life remains a meaningless expression. We regret—but it must be pointed out—that in some so-called Theosophical organizations and books vicarious atonement, forgiveness of sins and apostolic succession are preached and accepted. Our readers will have to distinguish between the real and immemorial Theosophy re-recorded by H. P. Blavatsky and neo-theosophy with all its corruptions of a messiah-in-our-midst, etc., etc.

³. Says *The Voice of the Silence* :—

“ Believe thou not that sitting in dark forests, in proud seclusion and apart from men ; believe thou not that life on roots and plants, that thirst assuaged with snow from the great Range—believe thou not, O Devotee, that this will lead thee to the goal of final liberation.”

“ Would'st thou thus dam the waters born on Sumeru ? Shalt thou divert the stream for thine own sake, or send it back to its prime source along the crests of cycles ?”

“ Self-doomed to live through future Kalpas, unthanked and unperceived by men ; wedged as a stone with countless other stones which form the ‘ Guardian Wall,’ such is thy future if the seventh Gate thou passest. Built by the hands of many Masters of Compassion, raised by their tortures, by their blood cemented, it shields mankind, since man is man, protecting it from further and far greater misery and sorrow.”—EDS.

But as to the person, methods or colour of the new Teacher, or even the wordly position into which he may be born, it would be vain and arrogant to speculate. Among the spiritual reformers in the past, Jesus only¹ came of what we call the humblest origins. Ikhnaton, of my instance, was a monarch of immense power; Gautama, Confucius and Lao Tse, people of some social importance in their earlier lives; Mohammed had acquired wealth by marriage and trading before he became the Prophet of Islam; and in recent years the great forerunner of what I believe must be in essence the new gospel, Mme. Blavatsky, was certainly not a daughter of the people. Wherefore, although we cannot in this connection seek precedents from history, it is at least possible that the new Teacher should be a person of some importance from birth; a point I am inclined to emphasize because the Christian tradition has taken such a hold on the public mind that there is a common tendency to presume that the circumstances surrounding the birth of Jesus will be repeated.

But so far as I personally can claim any settled beliefs in this relation, they are for the most part negative. I would keep an open mind, as free as possible from any prejudice, with regard to the person, status, or even in some particulars, the gospel of the Great Soul who will, I firmly believe, come to preach and inaugurate the new dispensation before the close of the present century. And I believe that if we are to recognise him when he comes, it will be by self-discipline, meditation and the culture of the divine essence in ourselves,² not by any attempt to forecast the character of the Messenger in the manner of his appearance.

J. D. BERESFORD.

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE.

[Below we print from **H. P. Blavatsky's** *Key to Theosophy*, pp. 241-43 a passage bearing on Mr. Beresford's article; the book was first published in 1889.—Eds.]

Every such attempt as the Theosophical Society has hitherto ended in failure, because, sooner or later, it has degenerated into a sect, set up hard-and-fast dogmas of its own, and so lost by imperceptible degrees that vitality which living truth alone can impart. You must remember that all our members have been bred and born in some creed or religion, that all are more or less of their generation both physically and mentally, and consequently that their judgment is but too likely to be warped and unconsciously biassed by some or all of these influences. If, then, they cannot be freed from such inherent bias, or at

¹. Not quite so: in the East, and especially in India, many a great Soul incarnated in the untouchable castes to deal a blow to the pride of the "higher castes," as well as to elevate the humble and the down-trodden.—Eds.

². Not forgetting the sterling advice of H. P. Blavatsky:—"Feel yourselves the vehicles of the whole humanity, mankind as part of yourselves, and act accordingly."—Eds.

least taught to recognise it instantly and so avoid being led away by it, the result can only be that the Society will drift off on to some sandbank of thought or another, and there remain a stranded carcass to moulder and die.

But if this danger be averted ?

Then the Society will live on into and through the twentieth century. It will gradually leaven and permeate the great mass of thinking and intelligent people with its large-minded and noble ideas of Religion, Duty, and Philanthropy. Slowly but surely it will burst asunder the iron fetters of creeds and dogmas, of social and caste prejudices; it will break down racial and national antipathies and barriers, and will open the way to the practical realisation of the Brotherhood of all men. Through its teaching, through the philosophy which it has rendered accessible and intelligible to the modern mind, the West will learn to understand and appreciate the East at its true value. Further, the development of the psychic powers and faculties, the premonitory symptoms of which are already visible in America, will proceed healthily and normally. Mankind will be saved from the terrible dangers, both mental and bodily, which are inevitable when that unfolding takes place, as it threatens to do, in a hot-bed of selfishness and all evil passions. Men's mental and psychic growth will proceed in harmony with his moral improvement, while his material surroundings will reflect the peace and fraternal good-will which will reign in his mind, instead of the discord and strife which is everywhere apparent around us to-day.....But I must tell you that during the last quarter of every hundred years an attempt is made by those "Masters," of whom I have spoken, to help on the spiritual progress of Humanity in a marked and definite way. Towards the close of each century you will invariably find that an outpouring or upheaval of spirituality—or call it mysticism if you prefer—has taken place. Some one or more persons have appeared in the world as their agents, and a greater or less amount of occult knowledge and teaching has been given out. If you care to do so, you can trace these movements back, century by century, so far as our detailed historical records extend.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

THE ETERNAL MOVEMENT.

[**Prajnanda** describes himself as a Buddhist monk of the Mahayana and Hinayana schools. He is an Englishman and was one of the early students of Theosophy. He served as an Officer during the War and was present at the Ypres and Somme battles. For the last six years he has travelled widely in India, Tibet, China and Burma.

His article enunciates some broad Theosophical truths. It is well for all of us to remember that greater and wider than any Theosophical organization is the Theosophical Movement: The Wisdom-Religion is the impartite Spirit, its vehicle the Theosophical Movement is the immortal Soul, and the many Theosophical organizations, the mortal bodies that come and go.—Eds.]

A student of the Inner Path has to bear in mind three important things. First, there is the Theosophia; second, the Theosophical Movement in the world; last, any Theosophical Organization.

The Theosophia is the Eternal Wisdom latent in Cosmic Ideation. It always is, was, and will be, and being Absolute Truth cannot be comprehended by the brain mind; the nearest approach to it, at our present stage of evolution, being Relative Truth.

The Theosophical Movement in the world is age long. It existed in the far distant past as it will continue for ages to come. It can exist quite apart from any organization, and has often done so. It is that centre in the mind of the Manu (the collective mind of man) which makes for unity, and seeks to raise the concrete mind to higher levels of expression. We can trace this Movement not only in the religious philosophies of the past, but in the rise and fall of nations and in the growth of new forms of civilization, art and invention. It is particularly active at the present time when evolution is being speeded up and new complex forces are playing upon the human race.

A Theosophical organization is the physical body in which the Movement may embody itself for the time being. It has appeared many times in the past under different names. We can find it in ancient India, Egypt and Greece, and it partly appeared in Europe during the Middle Ages under the Illuminati and the Rosicrucians. It was revived again by H. P. Blavatsky in 1875. The body always dies, for an organization made of physical beings follows physical laws. It has its birth, grows to fruition, becomes diseased or infirm, and then succumbs. But the Movement behind it lives on, and then embodies itself in new forms for outer expression.

Theosophy has nothing to do with Spiritism, Psychism or the lower magic. It does not deny abnormal phenomena, but explains, understands, and puts them in their right place. It works from above downwards, and not *vice versa*. In other words, it begins on the spiritual level and works down to the material. It aims at enlightening the human mind and thus disentangling it from the meshes of

Maya, the sensuous realms which distort more than they reveal. This great truth has been taught again and again by the world's spiritual Teachers.

These Teachers taught fragments of the Theosophia suited to the evolutionary needs of the race, but the concrete form-building mind of man soon twisted the Truth into religions, ceremonies and creeds. These beget persecution, caste hatred, separateness and priestcraft, and the knowledge of Oneness gets lost in jealousies and strife. Each religion paraded its own god as the only true one, and its way as the only true way. The beautiful Buddha Dharma was soon degraded, and the priests made dogmas of the very things he decried. The lofty morality of Christ was so misunderstood that there followed a thousand years of mental and spiritual darkness for Europe. Socrates drank the poisoned cup, Bruno perished in the flames.

But behind all this there is a great mystery, vaguely hinted at in Eastern writings as the Mystery of Narada, which we know is in some way connected with the law of sacrifice, that stern law by which the blood of the foremost men and women of the race is poured out for the helping of the less evolved, for no one can break away from the human kinship, without deadly and unnamable peril to himself. In the tragic lives of the world's leaders, idealists, pioneers and reformers, we can see how Brotherhood is real in a far deeper sense than most people understand.

Some of the changes we see in the world to-day may be described as part of the form-building aspect of the Theosophical Movement. First, there is the Sudra movement in operation. Every caste or class comes periodically into prominence under cyclic law. There were the times when priests ruled the nations, as in ancient India and Egypt, then the power passed to the kings, princes and warriors. At present the merchant caste is in ascendancy, with money, trade, credit, carrying the world's power. But the fourth, or lowest caste is due for recognition, hence we see the sudden rise of labour, democracy, and the interest in internationalism, untouchability, and social legislation. A smaller cycle, called the "Feminine Cycle," will bring woman into far greater activity in the world's affairs, and make her a co-worker with man in the evolution of the race. The "Pagan Movement" will advance what may be termed the "Grecian spirit" and bring a desire for more natural and healthy living, a building up of bigger and stronger physical bodies, and a greater appreciation of what may be termed natural religion as opposed to artificial theology.

The Theosophical Movement concerns itself with the physical, mental and spiritual progress of mankind. Anyone who is pledged in the seriousness and sanctity of his own Soul to live for the progress of the race becomes allied to this age-long Movement. For such an one has life a meaning and purpose; for he begins to live that timeless, spaceless life which is untouched by the net of Yama or the illusions of Maya.

PRAJNANDA.

PARABRAHMAN, THE ABSOLUTE.

II. IN EUROPEAN PHILOSOPHY.

[**Professor G. R. Malkani's** first instalment was published in our last number. In studying this instalment and comparing with the first, our readers will be struck, we hope, as forcefully as we have been once again, with the fact which H. P. Blavatsky pointed out, namely that "the modern metaphysicians, added to all past and present Hægels, Berkeleys, Schopenhauers, Herbert Spencers, and even the modern Hylo-Idealists to boot, are no better than the pale copyists of hoary antiquity."

In the Indian scholarly world of to-day there is a somewhat strong tendency to examine the ancient philosophers by the light of modern savants. In the interests of real culture it is very essential that some Indian scholars explain and expound the ancient philosophies of their native land by the light inherent in these old teachings. The world would really gain if it were shown the limitations of modern philosophies, coloured by Semitic theology and scientific materialism. The powerful Heart Light, which enlightened the minds of those old giants, has to be used for this purpose.

Once again we append a few extracts from H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, which add considerably to the interest and instruction of this article.—EDS.]

The conception of the Absolute in Western Philosophy is principally to be met in the writings of Spinoza, Hegel and some later English writers who were very much influenced by the philosophy of Hegel. We shall now consider the main features of the writings of each of these thinkers in turn.

I. SPINOZA.

The philosophy of Spinoza has a religious aim. What he sought for was an intuition of Absolute Truth. Religion and piety as ordinarily understood were, according to him, meant for practically-minded people, guided more by blind faith than by knowledge. But it is knowledge alone that can set man free. It alone can show that there are no divine commands apart from the necessity of nature, and that there is no reality apart from God. This knowledge was not conceived by him as excluding thought. It was not some sort of incommunicable mystic intuition. It was the accompaniment of clear and definite thinking based upon certain accepted definitions. Vedanta, which we have already considered, starts with Śruti texts. Spinoza starts with certain definitions (certainly based upon scriptural knowledge), and deduces the whole nature of reality from them.

Judaism as well as the Christian religion had taught that there was one God, and that the world had been created by him out of nothing. Spinoza held that this creation out of nothing was impossible. The true ground of the world was reality itself, and not "nothing". This ultimate reality in which everything was grounded he called substance.

The notion of substance is the central notion in the philosophy of Spinoza. He defines it as "that which exists in itself and is conceived by itself, *i.e.*, that which does not need the conception of any other thing in order to be conceived." It follows that this substance cannot itself be created by anything; it is its own cause or *causa sui*. It is also the only substance. For, if there were any other substance, the two would limit each other, and involve each other into a relation of dependence. But substance, by the very definition, depends upon nothing else. It is not a person, for a person is necessarily finite. It has neither intellect nor will; for both presuppose personality. This substance taken by itself is quite undetermined. It is indeed the ground of all things, but taken by itself nothing can be said of it except that it exists. In this sense it may be said that the deity is all and also nothing.

This substance is the true essence of all finite things. But at the same time, it does not exist apart from them. We might then say that God is nature. They are not two different entities. It is one and the same God. Only when he is looked at in his true essence and as the source of the world, he is called God; and when he is looked at as the sum-total of finite things, he is called nature.

God does not create the world in time. The world proceeds from his nature as necessarily as the properties of a triangle proceed from a triangle. The world therefore constitutes the proper nature of God, and may therefore be said to be as timeless as God himself. There is no creation. God may indeed be said to be the cause of the world. But he is not the temporal cause. He is only a rational cause; for the world is contained in him, and follows from him with logical necessity.

In order to understand the causality of God, we must take note of two or more conceptions: the conception of the attribute and that of the mode. We have seen that there is only one true substance. But we do not know this substance as such. We know instead two different kinds of substances: matter and mind. Spinoza argues that these are not really substances. Descartes had held before Spinoza that both these substances had been created by God which was the true ultimate substance. Spinoza reduces this position to its logical conclusion and contends that created substances are not substances at all, and that God alone is the substance. What then are matter and mind? Spinoza's answer is that they are the attributes of God. An attribute is defined as "that which the intellect perceives as constituting the essence of the substance." We know only two of these attributes of God, namely, Thought and Extension. But God in himself being infinite has infinite attributes. Each of these attributes, known as well as unknown, expresses or manifests the whole nature of God *in its own way*. The attribute of Extension manifests God as extended. The attribute of Thought manifests God as intellect and will, and so on.

A question will here arise. But substance has been conceived by Spinoza as being absolutely indeterminate and without qualities. How

can it have infinite attributes? God appears to be both an unqualified being and an infinitely qualified being. How is that possible? Some have therefore suggested that the attributes must not be conceived of as being inherent in God, the incomprehensible and indefinable being. They are what the human understanding ascribes to God. But that is not how Spinoza himself conceived them. For him, the attributes constituted the very nature of God. God is indeterminate and unqualified only in the sense that he has absolutely unlimited attributes. No attributes or a collection of attributes can therefore adequately express the divine nature.

Every attribute expresses the infinite nature of God, and is therefore itself infinite in that sense. But we cannot stop with the infinite attribute. Our experience relates to finite things. We have then the conception of the "mode" to account for the finite things of our experience. A mode is a certain modification of an attribute. All the material bodies that we know are the modes of the attribute of Extension. Particular thoughts or acts of the will are the modes of consciousness. In this way the whole finite world is deduced from God, who is the only true substance.

We may specially note here the place of the human mind in Spinoza's system. Spinoza regards the human mind as a mode of the attribute of Thought or Consciousness. But every modification of the attribute of Thought is correlated to a corresponding modification of the attribute of Extension. The question naturally arises: If there is this correlation, and if the human body ceases to exist, can the mind survive the body? The reply of Spinoza appears to be that "the human mind cannot be absolutely destroyed with the body, but something of it remains, which is eternal." Certainly he holds that when the mind has attained knowledge of itself as "an eternal mode of the infinite intellect of God," the greater and better part of mind does not perish with the body. It is to this part that the intellectual love of God belongs; and this love is eternal, being a part of the infinite intellectual love with which God loves himself. (Note: *Mind*, July 1929, pp. 304-05).

According to Spinoza, the philosopher cannot help loving God. "He cannot but feel perfectly contented, peaceful and resigned in contemplating Him." This complete acquiescence of the thinker, this entire devotion to the nature of things, is what Spinoza calls "the intellectual love of God, the source of eternal happiness." In this feeling, the difference between God and the soul is obliterated. Accordingly, the human soul, which is perishable in so far as its functions are connected with the life of the body, is immortal in its divine part, the intellect. By the immortality of the soul is meant not so much the infinite duration of the person, as the consciousness that its substance is eternal. That substance is God (see Weber's *History of Philosophy*).

We may conclude this short exposition of Spinoza's philosophy by pointing out that, according to him, the great error of our thought is that we look at things *sub specie temporis*, and consequently regard

things as separate and independent. But if we look at them *sub specie æternitatis*, we shall find that they are one substance that expresses itself in diverse ways. This substance is the only true reality, and everything else is real as manifesting It. We must then try to rise to the vision of the whole, the knowledge of that one substance which is God. Knowing him, we shall know the All and the Perfect, and we shall not act in the separatist spirit of finite individuals, always opposing our wills to the will of the whole,—but as instruments of God's eternal perfection and wisdom. The more we realise our true nature in God, the higher becomes the moral value of our acts.

Spinoza's conception of substance, it is evident, has much in common with the Vedantic conception of Brahman. It is the ultimate ground of everything, and it is the only reality. But while Brahman is essentially intelligence and can only be known as the Self of man, or Ātman, Spinoza regards substance in no such way. It is simply the substantial ground of the world and can only be known in those formal determinations which follow from its definition. The result is that substance becomes quite unknown and unknowable, a mere name which has nothing corresponding to it in our experience. Even consciousness, the highest form of being we know (not to speak of the human mind), is a mere attribute of this substance. What then is substance itself? Can we even call it spiritual?

There is a certain amount of similarity between Vedanta and Spinoza on the question of the creation of the world. According to Vedanta, Brahman is the substantial cause of the world, and there is identity of the effect with the cause. The world is therefore in reality Brahman, and nothing but the Brahman exists. According to Spinoza, God is the cause of the world as the permanent substratum of things, the innermost substance of the universe. Nature is not something different from God; it is identical with God. But here the similarity ends. For Vedanta, Brahman is the only reality, and whatever appears different from it, whatever appears in time, space and the realm of causality, does not really exist; it has only an apparent or *māyāyic* existence. It is superimposed upon the divine nature out of ignorance of that nature; and therein alone it appears to have real being. For Spinoza, the world, as known to us, is not unreal. Everything follows from the divine nature by the necessity of that nature. There are however certain assertions of Spinoza which are inconsistent with this position, and would tend to support the Vedantic view. He says, for example, that substance alone exists. "What can be negated is not substance and cannot exist; all determination is negation; all limit is not-being; the modes therefore cannot truly exist." Again he says, nothing can proceed from the infinite except the infinite. "If we view things *sub specie æternitatis* and reflect that all determination is negation, then all distinction and finiteness disappear, and we find that God is one and all is God." Thus Spinoza is also taken to deny the reality of the world, or to hold what is called acosmism. If we emphasise the reality of nature, we are driven

to a form of atheism. If we deny that reality, we get indeed God ; but we get nothing apart from him called the world.

Lastly, it will be noted that the world of finite things is not really deduced from God. Proceeding from ordinary experience, he has indeed been able to conceive his most real being, namely, substance. But he has not been able to show how out of this indeterminate substance the finite things of experience issue forth. His Absolute has therefore been compared to a lion's den, where all tracks are seen to be leading, but none returning.

II. HEGEL.

The next great thinker in modern philosophy who has propounded a system of Absolutism is Hegel. His system is very abstruse, but the main conclusions of his philosophy can be set forth quite simply. Plato had suggested centuries before that the *idea* of a thing constituted the true reality of it. The idea "man," for example, was the archetypal entity, changeless and eternal, while an actual man, as we meet him in sense, is but an imitation that indistinctly reflects the original idea. The world of ideas alone was the true world. Aristotle after him set out four different causes of a thing,—the material cause, the formal cause, the instrumental cause, and the final cause. But of these causes, the formal cause occupies a place of great prominence. The form of a thing is its truly intelligible essence. Mere matter is simply potential existence. It is to the extent that form supervenes upon matter that anything can be realised into being. Hegel takes his cue from these writers and from his predecessor Kant when he says that thought is the essence of everything real. Even God, if he is real, must be knowable, and have a place in the rational scheme of things. Nothing can be real which is not rational—which is not thought-pervaded.

The Absolute of Hegel is not of the nature of the ego. It is not an indifferent Absolute lying at the root of the ego and the not-ego, the subject and the object. It is Reason. This Reason, like Spinoza's Absolute, has no separate and transcendent existence. It is immanent in reality. But, unlike Spinoza's substance, it is not immovable, but active. It becomes by a sort of degradation, its own other ; it becomes nature which is the embodiment of Reason as objective. Having become nature, it cannot rest there in self-estrangement. There is a movement back upon itself. In this movement it becomes mind, the goal of nature and its highest development. From mind, by further evolution, it returns to its own rest in what he calls Absolute Spirit. It proceeds from "in-itself" to what is "for-itself," namely, nature, and then back to "in-itself and for-itself" in Spirit. This process is the metaphysical application of the mystic maxim : "Die to live." Thought becomes its own *other* in order that it should repossess itself. This, according to Hegel, is the law of all thought and the law of all being ; for there is no being apart from thought.

Thought was conceived by Kant to be subjective. It was simply a form of knowing, of the understanding. Beyond it was the world

of pure sense. Knowledge arose through the categories of the understanding working upon the material of sense. These thought-forms were also, taken by themselves, empty. Hegel conceives thought differently. It is not for him subjective. It goes beneath the opposition of subjective and objective and applies to both. It is on that account the true form of the Absolute. It is also not an empty form. It might be said in comparison with Kant's notion of it that it is a substantial form. It can give itself its own content, and not be dependent upon the content supplied to it by sense. It is in that sense creative of reality.

What is now that thought that constitutes the essence of all reality, and that is absolute in character? Hegel considers this question in the most important part of his writings, namely, *Logic*. Kant had given us certain categories of the understanding which he had more or less borrowed from formal logic. Hegel, on the other hand, holds that there is an inherent movement in reason, by analysing which we can get a complete list of thought-forms or categories. We may take up any thought, and we find that it discloses its own instability and inadequacy, and necessitates a movement beyond it to the most complete and adequate thought, namely, the Absolute Idea. We can thus rise, by gradual stabilisation and definition, from the most indeterminate category of thought, namely, that of pure being to the highest and the most stable. This movement of thought towards self-completion is called by Hegel *Dialectic*. It has three moments—thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. As soon as something is affirmed, it discloses its inadequacy and obliges us to affirm its negation. This becomes a patent contradiction, unless we can achieve a higher unity or synthesis in which the negated elements can both find a place and be rendered compatible.

The Absolute Idea is the highest synthesis. It is accordingly not empty of all content. Its content is the content of all the thoughts which are lower in the scale of self-completion. It is a unity that does not discard multiplicity. In fact it has no reality apart from the multiplicity. It takes up this multiplicity and gives it the form of a systematic or organic unity. An organic unity is a unity in which the whole implies every part, and every part implies the whole. Neither can be real without the other. A mere unity without any diversity is empty nothing. A mere diversity without unity will not even be diversity. Both are essential. A unity of co-ordinate elements is indeed precarious. But the unity that is arrived at by one aspect giving place to the next above it till the highest is reached, is both safe and real.

This is briefly the philosophy of Hegel. The first question that occurs is : Can all reality be reduced to the reality of thought? Now, however comprehensive a meaning we might give to thought, we must admit that there are elements of reality which go beyond thought. Kant supposed that the material of sense was other than thought. Hegel admits as much when he makes a distinction between thought

as it is in itself, and thought as nature or in the state of otherness. If thought were all, there would be no nature ; and it would be meaningless to say that thought was immanent in nature. But if nature is something, there is something besides thought that cannot be wholly reduced to its fixed and immutable forms.

Hegel conceives thought as going beneath the opposition of subject and object. Is this possible ? Can there be thought that is thought by nobody and exists, we might say, in a natural way ? Such thought would cease to be intelligent ; it would be, like matter, unintelligent ; and an unintelligent thought is as good as no thought.

Thought implies a thinker. The thinker cannot himself be thought. He is above thought. He gives thought the character of being intelligent. The highest category of being therefore is not thought but the thinker,—the person, the ego, the self. To reduce this to the reality of thought is to reverse their real values. Hegel regards spirit as being the reality of matter. But spirit is not thought. To keep it properly spiritual it must be conceived as the eternal subject, the Knower. This was in fact the criticism of Hegel against Spinoza. "Not substance, but subject," he insisted. But if the subject is the true nature of the Absolute, why degrade it to thought ? The reality of thought must itself be sought in the thinking spirit ; and it is the latter which alone can be the true basis of our idealistic interpretation of reality. This is the vital point of difference between the standpoint of Vedanta and that of Hegel.

Hegel contends that the hierarchy of thoughts, one rising above the other, which he has given us in his Logic, is arrived at by an analysis of thought itself. This is, however, not a fact. The thought which synthesises cannot be arrived at by merely comparing the thesis and the antithesis ; it is a new jump in thought, suggested by our more adequate experience of reality. But if that is so, the inner movement of thought, which is supposed in Hegel's Logic to culminate in the Absolute Idea, cannot be a purely rational process. There is such a thing as experience, which sets limits to, and directs rational processes. Experience then is greater than Reason, Hegel's Absolute ; and when we judge the nature of reality, we must base our conclusions upon experience as a whole, which may go beyond thought, and not upon the so-called necessary connections of ideas. Reality is more than reason ; it is experience.

Lastly we may note that Hegel's writing is comprehensive of differences. But can the differences be real in the unity ? They can continue to be real only in so far as they are imperfectly unified. If the unity is perfect, there is no way of saving the differences. Indeed the concept of end or purpose is one which renders it possible to conceive differences as being consistent with unity. But that is only because a purposive unity is only a partial unity of the parts. The parts have a being of their own which is not *wholly* subservient to the purpose. As there can be no perfect unity of our organism, so neither can there be a real and complete unity of differences.

III. BRADLEY.

Bradley is another important writer who has developed a system of Absolute Idealism. He has tried to make good some of the faults of Hegel. He has examined the various categories of thought, such as time and space, substance and quality, relations, etc., which we employ in our experience of reality; he has then shown that each of them involves self-contradiction. Whatever part of reality, therefore, has its nature determined by these categories is appearance; it is not reality. Reality must be free from contradiction. Also reality must be of the stuff of experience. What is not experienced, and is not made of the stuff of experience, is real in no sense of the term. Reality then is essentially an experience. This experience must have a content. What other content can it have except the content of appearance? Appearance then is the only content of the Absolute Experience. Only in it, the self-contradiction of appearance is removed. Appearance is not nothing. It is reality itself when the contradictions are removed.

It might be argued that appearance, as appearance, must at least be wholly unreal. Bradley, however, does not subscribe to that view. He holds that an appearance is something. Between it and reality that fully realises the principle of non-contradiction, the distinction is not that of "what is not" and "what is," or of the unreal and real. It is only a distinction of "more or less of reality," or of the degree of reality. The degree is determined by the test of comprehensiveness and of harmony. A concept becomes more and more adequate to reality, as the range of its application or of inclusiveness increases, and as it realises greater harmony of meaning; and these two tests are interconnected. The ideal, however, is never attained in thought at all. It is attained only in Absolute Experience. Bradley has indeed not drawn up a hierarchy of concepts similar to Hegel's in accordance with this view. But it is quite evident that he is in spirit quite at one with Hegel on this point. Hegel showed how the higher categories included the lower and yet superseded them in adequacy. Bradley does not work out in detail a hierarchy of categories, but he suggests nothing less in his conception of the degrees of truth and of reality.

All thought-knowledge is of the form of judgment. A judgment involves the distinction of the subject and the predicate. Bradley has shown that this form of knowledge can never be adequate to reality. The subject stands for reality, and the predicate for some ideal content. Once this separation is made, thought can never get over it. But if it does not get over it, the ideal of knowledge will never be realised. What is ideal will always remain ideal; it will never be equivalent to the real; the predicate will always fall short of reality. In short, our knowledge will always remain ideal, and reality real; the two will never become one substance so to say. The Absolute Experience, therefore, is not of the form of a judgment. It does not involve the distinction of the subject and the object. It is not governed by thought. It supersedes thought

and all its relations. It is a "one entire whole without relations and without distinctions." It approximates to feeling in this respect. It is an intuition of the whole above and beyond thought.

It will be seen that Bradley has given up Hegel's idea that the Absolute is of the nature of Thought. In the place of Thought, he has set up an experience of the whole that combines all the aspects of the finite experience and supersedes them. But this is hardly any real improvement. We cannot think of an experience absolute or otherwise, without an experient, — a soul or self that has that experience. According to Bradley, the ego is a later development out of more primitive experience, which is of the nature of feeling and which does not involve the distinction of the ego and the not-ego. But even feeling, however undifferentiated and primitive, implies an individuated being that has the feeling. The ego may be a later development so far as our consciousness of it is concerned. That consciousness is not possible without mature thinking. But that does not mean that in point of fact the ego is non-existent in primitive experience, or that the original type of experience is non-personal. It is bad psychology to suppose that because rudimentary experience does not of itself rise to the level of self-consciousness, that there is therefore no self or individual who has that experience. Even experience that is all-embracing can never be possible without a self. Bradley's Absolute Experience is a soul-less experience, and so far unreal. It is as impossible as Hegel's Absolute based on the ultimate character of thought.

The Absolute Experience is said to contain all the diversity without implying any relations. Such a view would be absurd, if it were not meaningless. Diversity can never be real in any form or sense without the reality of relations. We have already pointed out that unity can never be perfect to the extent that differences are real. And yet the Absolute Experience is supposed to achieve a real unity of differences without abolishing them. Bradley indeed says that the appearances are transformed in that experience. But will this transformation retain anything of the old appearances? If it does, then so far they are real without being transformed. But if nothing is left as it was, how is transformation different from abolition?

It would have been thought that anything that involves self-contradiction is not real, and cannot be supposed to exist truly. But Bradley thinks otherwise. Not only does he think that what contradicts itself may yet exist somehow, but that ultimately it is only a question of degrees of reality. His argument to support his view that there are degrees of truth and of reality is altogether inconsistent with the first part of his book *Appearance and Reality*, where he argues with great elaboration that what contradicts itself cannot be of the nature of the real. If we admit his thesis of the degrees of reality, there is no real and fundamental distinction between what he calls appearance and what he calls reality. The truth is that we cannot give reality to appearances without giving it fully. But if we must deny them reality, then equally inevitably

we must deny it of them wholly. Appearances are indeed what appear. But when we deny reality of them, their status becomes the status of mere appearances, illusory in character, that have no reality except in our ignorance of the true nature of things. Such plain conclusion few thinkers have the courage to face even though they would have us believe that reality is truly one, and that the diversity which we see is not as such real.

G. R. MALKANI.

The very word "God" in the singular, embracing all the gods—or *theos* from *theoi*—came to the "superior" civilized nations from a strange source, one entirely and as pre-eminently *phallic* as the sincere, open-spoken *lingham* of India. The attempt to derive God from the Anglo-Saxon synonym "good" is an abandoned idea, for in no other language, in all of which the term varies more or less, from the Persian Khoda down to the Latin *Deus*, has an instance been found of a name of God being derived from the attribute of *Goodness*. To the Latin races it comes from the Aryan *Dyaus* (the Day); to the Slavonian, from the Greek Bacchus (*Bagh-bog*); and to the Saxon races, directly from the Hebrew *Yodh* or *Jod*.—*Secret Doctrine* I, 346-7.

It may be correctly stated that were Leibnitz' and Spinoza's systems reconciled, the essence and Spirit of esoteric philosophy would be made to appear. From the shock of the two—as opposed to the Cartesian system—emerge the truths of the Archaic doctrine. Both opposed the metaphysics of Descartes. His idea of the contrast of two substances—Extension and Thought—radically differing from each other and mutually irreducible, was too arbitrary and too unphilosophical for them. Thus Leibnitz made of the two Cartesian substances two attributes of one universal unity, in which he saw God. Spinoza recognized but one universal indivisible substance and absolute ALL, like Parabrahmam. Leibnitz on the contrary perceived the existence of a plurality of substances. There was but ONE for Spinoza; for Leibnitz an infinitude of Beings, *from*; and *in*, the One. Hence, though both admitted but *one real Entity*, while Spinoza made it impersonal and indivisible, Leibnitz divided his *personal* Deity into a number of divine and semi-divine Beings. Spinoza was a *subjective*, Leibnitz an *objective* Pantheist, yet both were great philosophers in their intuitive perceptions.

Now, if these two teachings were blended together and each corrected by the other,—and foremost of all the One Reality weeded of its personality—there would remain as sum total a true spirit of esoteric philosophy in them; the impersonal, attributeless; absolute divine

essence which is *no* "Being," but the root of all being. Draw a deep line in your thought between that ever-incognizable essence, and the, as invisible, yet comprehensible Presence (*Mulaprakriti*), or *Schekinah*, from *beyond and through which* vibrates the Sound of the *Verbum*, and from which evolve the numberless hierarchies of intelligent *Egos*, of conscious as of semi-conscious, *perceptive* and *apperceptive* Beings whose essence is spiritual Force, whose Substance is the Elements and whose Bodies (when needed) are the *atoms*—and our doctrine is there. —*Secret Doctrine* I, 628-29.

The Hegelian doctrine, which identifies *Absolute Being* or "Be-ness" with "non-Being," and represents the Universe as an *eternal becoming*, is identical with the Vedanta philosophy—*Secret Doctrine* II, 449.

Nature is never stationary during *manvantara*, as it is ever *becoming*, not simply *being*. According to the great metaphysician Hegel also. For him Nature was a *perpetual becoming*. A purely esoteric conception. Creation or Origin, in the Christian sense of the term, is absolutely unthinkable. As the above-quoted thinker said: "God (the Universal Spirit) *objectivises himself as Nature*, and again rises out of it."—*Secret Doctrine*, I, 257.

Hegel, the great German thinker, must have known or sensed intuitively this truth when saying, as he did, that the Unconscious evolved the Universe only "in the hope of attaining clear self-consciousness," of becoming, in other words, *MAN*; for this is also the secret meaning of the usual Purāṇic phrase about *Brahmā* being constantly "moved by the desire to create."—*Secret Doctrine* I, 106-107.

According to Hegel, the "Unconscious" would never have undertaken the vast and laborious task of evolving the Universe, except in the hope of attaining clear Self-consciousness. In this connection it is to be borne in mind that in designating Spirit, which the European Pantheists use as equivalent to Parabrahm, as unconscious, they do not attach to that expression of "Spirit"—one employed in the absence of a better to symbolise a profound mystery—the connotation it usually bears.

The "Absolute Consciousness," they tell us, "behind" phenomena, which is only termed unconsciousness in the absence of any element of personality, transcends human conception. Man, unable to form one concept except in terms of empirical phenomena, is powerless from the very constitution of his being to raise the veil that shrouds the majesty of the Absolute. Only the liberated Spirit is able to faintly realise the nature of the source whence it sprung and whither it must eventually return. . . . As the highest Dhyan Chohan, however, can but bow in ignorance before the awful mystery of Absolute Being ; and since, even in that culmination of conscious existence—"the merging of the individual in the universal consciousness"—to use a phrase of Fichte's—the Finite cannot conceive the Infinite, nor can it apply to it its own standard of mental experiences, how can it be said that the "Unconscious" and the Absolute can have even an instinctive impulse or hope of attaining clear self-consciousness? A Vedantin would never admit this Hegelian idea ; and the Occultist would say that it applies perfectly to the awakened MAHAT, the Universal Mind already projected into the phenomenal world as the first aspect of the changeless ABSOLUTE, but never to the latter. "Spirit and Matter, or Purusha and Prakriti are but the two primeval aspects of the One and Secondless," we are taught.—*Secret Doctrine* I, 51.

In the Secret Doctrine the concealed UNITY—whether representing PARABRAHMAM, or the "GREAT EXTREME" of Confucius, or the Deity concealed by PHTA, the Eternal Light, or again the Jewish EN-SOPH, is always found to be symbolized by a circle or the "nought" (absolute *No-Thing* and Nothing, because it is *infinite* and the ALL).—*Secret Doctrine*, II, 553.

CONTACTING THE INVISIBLE.

II.—MEDIUMS AND MEDIUMSHIP.

[This is the second instalment of a carefully prepared statement on the subject of intercommunications between the visible and the invisible. It deals with the fading away of Spiritualism, of the growth of Psychism and of the dangers of mediumship and the degradation of mediums.—EDS.]

THEOSOPHY, Mediumship, and Psychism are terms which may serve to indicate the three paths of Occultism, as distinguished from those occasional experiences which occur to practically every human being. These last named experiences form the real substratum of popular belief in Magic, of which the three classes of practitioners are rather the outcome than the originators.

Always on the assumption that there are higher as well as lower worlds in Nature than known to us, it cannot be unreasonable to infer that all species of belief and practice in intercommunication probably have their actual origin outside the sphere of strictly human consciousness. What is experienced here is an effect, and not a cause. This can easily be seen on the reflection that although the phenomena are known, the explanation has to be sought either in the theory of miracles or else in the hypothesis of laws presently unknown to us, of factors in Nature only dimly guessed at, of forces operative in, on, and through our world by which we are affected, but which we do not know how to control. All this is the raw material for the theory and practice of Magic in any of its forms: that Intercommunication is possible from this side as well as from the other, and that its rationale may be learned.

Of the three, it is to be noted that Mediumship, on which the theories of Spiritualism rest, was the earliest in our times to attract attention. Although it is barely three-quarters of a century since the phenomena of the Fox sisters opened wide a door, Spiritualism to-day is decadent. There have not been for years mediums in any way comparable to scores which excited a genuine revival of interest in intercommunications from 1850 to 1875. Mediumship has been replaced almost entirely by Psychism—a something unrecognized during the palmy days of Spiritualism. In the excitement of each new thing under the sun the old is speedily forgotten, so that few now living recall the great furòre over Spiritualism, which endured for one generation only, but in that period commanded a greater interest, special and general, than Darwin's theory of evolution—than even the rise of Modern Science itself. Mediumship and Spiritualism have never been philosophically considered, least of all by mediums and spiritualists themselves. They have recorded an immense array of facts, but who has studied those facts with a view to their classification, their co-ordination, their rationale, in the same way that modern scientific students have pursued their researches into the phenomena of the world physical? There has been no more scientific study of Spiritualism

than of Religion. Men have been content, first with the experiences, and then with this or that among the thousand and one "revealed" or speculatively suggested explanations. Without a Science of Spiritualism how can there be a Philosophy of the subject? Spiritualism, then, like religion, has made no progress; and since nothing can stand still in any imaginable world, physical or metaphysical, it follows that there has been inevitable retrogression: Spiritualism has already returned to the world of the "spirits" from which it came, a premature death following a premature birth.

Nevertheless, Spiritualism did not die without issue. So far as known facts permit of deduction, Psychism is the legitimate offspring of mediumship. Psychism is, in many quarters, as rampant now as was Mediumship a half century ago. So some consideration of the ancestry of Psychism will throw, perhaps, a more understanding light on the present status of this branch of intercommunications. Certain important factors prevail in Mediumship as they prevail in Psychism. Their identity is unmistakable.

The characteristic marks and essential conditions of Mediumship appear to be unvarying, for they are shown by the whole history of Spiritualism. First in order, perhaps, is the fact of passivity. The Medium does not in any case produce the phenomena. What the medium does is to throw himself into a condition of consciousness which makes possible the production of phenomena through him, the actual operators and active agents or agencies remaining invisible because incorporeal in our sense. All that any Spiritualist or so-called Psychical Researcher knows of the nature of these entities is what they themselves transmit through the body of the medium, using that body as their bridge into this world. Aside from the messages thus received on this side, all is inference and imagination. Not only are the theories propounded many and conflicting, as might be expected, but the messages themselves are equally confusing and irreconcilable. Those messages which relate to matters of this world are, when verified, very often taken as conclusive proof of the nature of the "control" and of the statements transmitted as to the nature of the "other world." Hence the chaotic nature of Spiritualism.

The best that can be urged in behalf of Spiritualism is that the messages obtained through Mediumship have demonstrated in our age the existence in and around us of more or less intelligent beings in states of matter and conditions of consciousness otherwise unknown to us, and by so much made it easier for many to believe in human survival after physical death. Nothing has been added to human knowledge in any scientific or philosophic sense. The mysteries of birth and death, of life here and hereafter, the problem of good and evil, are no nearer solution than before. The phenomena of Spiritualism have but added to the sum-totals already existing of facts for which no adequate, because no rational and moral, explanation has ever been found by mankind at large.

This brings one naturally to consider another characteristic of Mediumship. Not only must the Will of the medium be paralyzed,

but the Reason must undergo a complete metamorphosis. The reason of the normal human being is exercised on the basis provided by the experiences of waking consciousness. Waking human consciousness constantly involves the Will, the Reason, and the Moral Nature. Mediumship, to be successful, requires that the will shall be discarded, the reason inverted, the moral nature ignored. This is also the exact condition of insanity, of delirium, of drug addiction, intoxication, and hypnotism. In all these cases phenomena are exhibited which cannot be explained on any rational basis. The facts are there, but who understands them? And yet, on the theory that this is a universe of law and order, there must exist a rational explanation of the most irrational occurrences. The phenomena of hallucinations and the phenomena of Mediumship are the same; the mental, moral, and volitional constituents of normal human beings have suffered similar catastrophes in the various aberrations named. In all these cases something has happened by which the normal oscillation of human life has been so intensified that the *man* is no longer responsible for what he says and does. What does it all mean?

It is certain that no one cultivates or practices Mediumship to purify his motives, to strengthen his will, to exercise his reason, or to discipline his moral nature. The reverse effect on all these elements of the Medium's nature must be induced by this species of Occultism, if for no other occasion than that the energies of the practitioner are more and more absorbed in a contrary direction of consciousness to that which constitutes the balanced human life. And this, irrespective of the theorem of the possible influence on the nature of the medium through contamination by the nature of the "control". Is this latter to be seriously considered? Surely, all men are familiar with the fact of contagion, physical, moral, and mental, from the intimate or even casual contact of living men and other beings. Granting that Mediumship is a path to intercommunication with beings of another world than our own, how could any Medium, or any who patronize Mediumship, hope to escape being affected by the contact? The price paid by the Medium is one that precludes his gaining any spiritual, moral, or intellectual benefit from the practice, but it certainly must lay him open without defence to infection. There is no record of any Medium who has become a better man as a result of his mediumship, but there is a truly dreadful list of those who have been made worse by their experiences. And in degree the same consequences must befall those who countenance and support the practice. These, for the most part, may be likened to those who would profit by the drink and drug traffic without themselves becoming addicts. In the end they must, on any theory of moral justice, fall victim to the same or worse evils. The vivisectionist, and those who defend him and his supposed benefits to mankind, would be the last to wish to submit themselves to the experiments which are performed upon helpless animals. The hypnotist would resist to his capacity anyone who tried to hypnotize *him*. Those who defend Mediumship and its fruits and endeavour to profit by it at second hand are the very last to wish

to become mediums themselves. If there were any possibility of good in Mediumship itself, surely every one who believes in its messages would desire first and foremost himself to become a medium, so as to secure its benefits direct. That this is not the case is ample evidence that there is dulness of the moral nature, defective reasoning power, a lack of right motive, *already* in those attracted to Spiritualism. Those breaches in their nature must be widened and deepened, if they yield to the attraction which Mediumship offers them as a door to the "unseen world".

Anyone so minded can easily investigate the subject of Mediumship from the records made by itself, and more than substantiate all that has here been indicated. Those records are such as to make the thoughtful man wish rather to close this door to the Occult than to open it, whether in others or in himself. As known and practiced, its history shows it admits to unknown regions *below*, not above, human consciousness.

[The next instalment will be on "Mediums, Psychics. and Religions".]

WHO, WHERE, WHAT IS GOD?

[B. M. is an old-world man living by his old-world methods in our era. We are fortunate in having secured a few reports of his talks to his intimate friends. The Bhagavad-Gita is the book he has mastered through long years of study and meditation; but further, having lived according to its tenets more successfully than is generally possible, his thoughts breathe a peculiar fragrance. The papers have been translated from the vernacular; it should be understood that they are not literal translations, and the translator has adhered more to ideas and principles than to words. Although B. M. knows English, his inspiration becomes impeded in employing that medium of expression and so he prefers not to use it. We think our readers will find real inspiration in this series.—EDS.]

“Behold, O son of Pritha, my forms by hundreds and by thousands, of diverse kinds divine, of many shapes and fashions.”

—*Bhagavad-Gita*, XI. 5.

By study and search truth can be known about all things and about the source of all things. The general ignorance and confusion about the nature of Deity is chiefly due to the notion that nothing can be really known about it. This is contrary to the teachings of all sages, seers and prophets. Such Divine Men as Krishna and Rama, Gotama and Tsong-Kha-Pa, Jesus and Zarathushtra, Lao Tzu and Pythagoras, have taught how they attained the knowledge of the Supreme, nay more, how we too can attain. We may not succeed so completely, but surely we are capable of learning something of what they taught, of practising what we learn, and of realizing, in some measure, the fruits of our practice.

Almost all religions have been degraded, and the grand concept of an omnipresent, eternal, boundless and immutable Principle which is Life and Deity has become transformed into an illogical and absurd belief in a Personal God, outside of His Universe. It is late in the day to write against the blasphemy which is connected with the idea of a Personal God; it is impossible for intuition to accept, and for reason to assent to, the dogma of belief in a Personal God, separate from His Universe which, for some mysterious and never to be found out purpose, He has created. Every thinking man has put away that childish superstition.

Religion is supposed to be a matter of belief; it ought to be a subject for study, for strong search, for fearless questioning.

In all religions, Deity is said to be omnipresent and the simple logical deduction is that It is everywhere and in all things. The notion of everywhere is related to space, and therefore we can say that space is another name for Deity.

Also in all religions Deity is emanating; from within Its bosom things, forces and beings stream forth. But this is the property of Life. Forms of Life are made by Life, made of Life, made in Life. With propriety then we can name Deity as Life.

Thus Living Space, known and to be known, emerges as our primary concept of God or Deity.

This brings us to the second idea of all religious philosophies: the dual aspects of the One Concept—Space and Life, Matter and Spirit, Body and Soul. These are two aspects of the One Reality which is Deity. Ignorance and misunderstanding of this teaching have produced the faulty view of God and Satan, Ormazd and Ahriman. The correct teaching is that good and evil are but relative aspects of the One. Thus Spirit and Matter are but a pair, like Spento and Anglo Mainyu of our Parsi brothers, both aspects of the One Life, of the One Ahura Mazda. (See *Yasna*, XLV—2.)

But there is a third factor, which also all ancient religious philosophies have taken account of—Intelligence of Spirit and of Matter, of Spento and of Anglo, of God and of Satan. Life in Space, Spirit in Matter, Spento operating with Anglo, Satan fighting against God, all imply and indicate the existence of Intelligence, of Mind. This is degraded into the carnalized and anthropomorphized notion of the Trinity and Trimurti—three Persons, three Separate Gods, to be prayed to and propitiated.

Life, Space, Intelligence are three aspects of Deity, omnipresent and ever active. Nowhere in nature is anything bereft of these three. Dead things are alive; there is no empty space; some form of intelligence works incessantly everywhere.

How can these metaphysical ideas be used by us in a practical manner?

If Deity is everywhere it also manifests Itself as Life, Space and Intelligence in the human kingdom and therefore in all human beings. What we know ordinarily as Spirit, Soul and Body are Life, Intelligence and Space or Matter. Our intelligence or mind is the connecting link between our Individual Spirits and our bodily senses, organs and the brain. Our mentality has unfolded to the extent which enables us to be self-conscious of ourselves. Intelligence which is self-conscious is the human soul in each of us. It is unfolding, all the time; most men do not even know that unconsciously to themselves their intelligent souls are growing. It is a stupendous change in us when we clearly perceive that the growth of the Soul is the purpose of human life. Not the acquisition of wealth, not the gain of fame, not the exertion of power or even of love on our fellow-men, is the purpose of human existence, but to learn of our own natures, spiritual, mental and bodily, to find the ways of deliberate and quickened unfolding of all three, according to and under Law. We find out by study, meditation and sacrifice that each one of us is Deity, the Mysterious Lord Krishna. "Our Father who art in heaven" of whom the Christian prayer speaks is our own Divine Soul with which, like Jesus, we shall realize our one-ness by living as he lived. Each one of us will dance, like Shiva, the Dance of Life, when all our passions and lusts have been consumed in the fire of knowledge which is symbolized by the burning place where Shiva is to be found.

A correct view of prayer as communion with the spiritual and divine aspect of ourselves which is to be found in the closet of the heart will take us into a new universe. We shall begin to look for the expression of Deity in our brother-men, and proceeding we shall perceive. Its working in the many kingdoms of nature, and growing we shall gain the Vision of Arjuna who saw the Deity as Universe, the Body of Life, mysterious, conscious, resplendent, in which everything lives and moves and has its being—we blundering mortals included.

B. M.

REINCARNATION AND MEMORY.

Apropos of discussion going on in your journal on the subject allow me to draw attention to the following case. An interesting commentary on the self-made barriers which some present-day scientists have erected, beyond which they do not push their investigations, is found in their reported reaction to a phenomenon occurring in Poland, where a little Polish girl speaks a language she never had heard.

Without having evinced previous peculiar or unusual symptoms, little Marie Glashan Skotinicki, of Warsaw, suddenly began to talk to herself in a strange tongue that her parents could not understand, but which the family physician recognized as pure Gaelic.

Since the child had never been away from her native city, nor heard any other language except Polish, the scientific world has examined the case with interest and has no solution to the mystery, other than an admittedly far-fetched explanation, in the fact that Marie's great-grandfather was born and raised on the Island of Lewis, the largest of the outer Hebrides group, off the north-west coast of Scotland, where Gaelic of unusual purity is spoken. As the scientists state, however, they see little hope of "explaining the girl's behaviour through this clue," because her great-grandfather died several years before she was born.

This is not a case without parallel, and is not without simple explanation if we go beyond the scant years of one life. May not the theory of reincarnation or many lives on earth for the evolving soul, in different countries, families and environments, give more than a "clue" to the solution of this so-called mystery? Is it not a more logical explanation that in some other life little Marie spoke Gaelic as her native tongue, and when conditions, physiological and psychological permitted, the memory of the language which she once knew came to the foreground of her normal consciousness.

VERA GRAYSON.

THE FESTIVAL OF SERPENTS.

[N. Kasturi Iyer, M.A., B.L., this month writes on Naga-Panchami, a well known Hindu festival which this year fell on 30th July.

We do not agree with our author that the festival arose out of "simple child-like terror through the ages." In ancient India, Naga-Puja, worship of Dragons and Serpents, was a Mystery Rite of the learned, who endeavoured to impart soul-knowledge to the masses through it. In later days most of the knowledge was lost and superstition took its place. It would be a glorious revival if the learned of modern India were to observe this Festival with understanding.—EDS.]

Naga-Panchami—the fifth day of the bright fortnight of Sravan, the first month of the Indian rainy season—is the serpent festival of the Hindus. That day the thousands of Naga-Shrines, springs, pools, wells and hills scattered through the land quicken into activity, and the orthodox householder has to perform rites and bestow gifts to appease the wrath or to win the grace of the mysterious children of the earth, the serpents.

The Maharani of Baroda, mounted on an elephant, proceeds that day to the woods in order to worship at an ant-hill, the visible entrance to the magnificent underworld of serpents. The pipers who accompany the procession blow their pipes and, allured by the sound, the snakes come out of their holes and are fed with milk.

It is interesting to know that on this day pandits learned in grammar assemble at Naga-Kupa, an old well at Benares, to do honour to Patanjali, the greatest of Sanskrit grammarians, held as an avatar of the King of Serpents, Sesha (¹)

In Bengal a goddess named Manasa or Visha-hari (the poison-destroyer), the kind sister of Vasuki the Serpent King, "a handsome female of a golden colour, seated on a water lily, clothed with snakes," is offered worship on Naga-Panchami.

In many villages a big earthen image of a serpent is erected and consecrated in a public place and worshipped by the entire populace, women singing songs, dancing round the shrine, and men rolling themselves on earth to expiate their sins. Enterprising beggars carry about snakes on Naga-Panchami enabling devotees to feed the living Nagas at their very door. According to the Hindu books of domestic ritual, "there should be no digging of the earth, either by day or by night" on the sacred day, lest any of the species be killed unawares. No fruits or vegetables are picked; no trees are felled, for the serpent is closely associated and generally identified with the spirits of the trees. Entrance to the Hindu home is decorated by representations of these "Seers and Symbols of the Ancient Silence"; and

(¹) This refers to the affiliation of Patanjali to the Lodge of the Eternal Ones—the occult progeny of Sesha. The well of the serpents, containing the Waters of Life and Wisdom at which the Brahmins assemble, is a true and a grand symbol. It may be an empty rite now; time was when its magic worked as a blessing to all pure seekers of Truth.—EDS.

gold or silver images of the great Nagas are worshipped and offered as gifts to Brahmins. Towards evening some ant-hill or traditional haunt of snakes is visited and ceremonially revered, and stories of the Nagarajas or of their devotees are read or repeated.

Snake worship is universal. It has persisted through all ages, but in no other part of the world is the serpent cult more widely distributed or developed in more varied and interesting forms than in India. One reason for this is certainly the fact that India is the only country inhabited by all the known families of snakes and the toll of human lives taken by snake bite is appallingly huge—which is a symbol in itself, of double meaning.

The Yajur-Veda hymn says :—

Homage be to the snakes !

Whichsoever move along the Earth,
Which are in sky and in heaven,
Homage be to those snakes.

Which are the arrows of Sorcerers
And of Tree-Spirits
And which lie in holes,
Homage be to those snakes.

Which are in the brightness of heaven,
Which are in the rays of the sun,
Which have made their abode in waters,
Homage be to those snakes ⁽¹⁾.

“The animal was dreaded and revered on account of the mysterious dangers associated with it, its stealthy habits, the cold fixity of its gaze, its sinuous motion, the protrusion of its forked tongue, and the suddenness and deadliness of its attacks.” It had a swift, graceful, gliding motion without legs or arms. It had no external auditory organs but seemed to hear through the eyes. Its forked tongue licked up the air which, apparently, was its food. The serpent was therefore a great ascetic ; it could kill, almost instantaneously, by a bite, a breath or even a look. It had the unique power of casting off its skin, and thus was the symbol of perpetual resurrection, of immortality. It came out just after the rains. Serpents were seen to haunt houses and graveyards, appearing from nowhere and disappearing all too soon, and were regarded as presiding guardians. They lived in holes under the earth. Were they not the owners of the soil, who must be duly satisfied before houses are built or fields are ploughed ? They are the powerful beings who know the secret

⁽¹⁾ Homage is here paid to the different classes of Dragons of Wisdom who are the instructors of mankind. They are not species of reptiles but Jivan-Muktas, of different vocations, Mahatmas who labour on earth in physical bodies ; Nirmana-Kayas who bless super-physically ; and Dhyani-Buddhas who bless, living in the infinitudes of space. Arrows of Sorcerers and of Tree-Spirits are names of certain forces which Beings of Power use.

Like the symbol of the Tree, the serpent also is a dual symbol—that of the astral light which bewitches and that of the Akasha which enlightens.—Eds.

of the seed, the silent process of fecundity ; the guardians of great treasures hidden away in the bowels of the earth ; custodians of gems, jewels, magic stones, wonder working spells and talismans. Some species lived in water, and were regarded as guardians of rain, masters of the hailstorms ⁽¹⁾.

Entire tribes and communities proudly derive their origin from the denizens of Nagaloka. The dynasty of Kashmir had the great Naga, Karkota, as its mythical ancestor. The Rajas of Chota-Nagpur consider Pundarika as the founder ⁽²⁾.

The earth itself is resting on the many headed Sesha or Ananta, the symbol of eternity. When this Atlas of the Hindus shifts its burden from head to head the earth quakes ⁽³⁾.

In India the serpent is the great symbol of psychic power, the Kundalini Shakti, the mighty secret energy of Man, which her ascetics try to arouse. So, too, the primordial solar force, semi-latent within the aura of every human being was known to the Greeks as the Speirema, Serpent Coil. Madame Blavatsky writes in *The Voice of the Silence*: "Kundalini is called the 'Serpentine' or the *annular* power on account of its spiral-like working or progress in the body of the ascetic developing the power in himself. It is an electric, fiery, occult, or *Fohatic* power, the great pristine force which underlies all organic and inorganic matter." The worship of the ant-hill, too, as evidenced by the Valmika-Sutra, was early symbolised and the Valmika or ant-hill represented the human body at the bottom of which lies concealed the cobra, motionless and inert, because he has become the "Almsman in whom the Cankers are no more." Everyone of us is an ant-hill, a Garden of Eden, with the Serpent poisonous, hateful and virulent, and the task of Sadhana is to curb and conquer it and render its wickedness ineffective ; when thus transformed it is the Dragon of Wisdom.

Thus from simple child-like terror, man has developed through the ages an expansive cult pictured in folklore and tradition, art and myth, religion and ritual, song and symbol. In the words of Dr. Vogel, author of the invaluable book on Indian Serpent-Lore, "the Naga-Panchami continues to testify to the feelings of awe and veneration which the serpent evokes in the minds of the population since the earliest times we have cognisance of."

N. KASTURI IYER.

⁽¹⁾ Every detail of this description of our author is a symbol and all true students of occultism are well qualified to interpret all the clauses.—EDS.

⁽²⁾ Kashmir and Nagpur were old Centres of occult culture and are not devoid of power even to-day, say those who know. Dynasties of Wise Rulers—Raja-Rishis—governed there in very old days.—EDS.

⁽³⁾ This has reference to cosmical and astronomical phenomena, chiefly to the tilting of the Pole. See H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*.—EDS.

FROM PARIS.

[Pressure on our space has delayed our printing the February letter; we publish here two; they show that the tendency in France for a Universal Religion exists just as it does in Great Britain about which Mr. D. L. Murray and Mr. J. D. Beresford wrote in our previous numbers. Our Indian readers will be particularly interested in the reference to Vivekananda made by our good friend and able correspondent—**Mlle. M. Dugard.**—EDS.]

February, 1930.

There is a saying that the true historian should be of no time and of no country. Some novelists seem to believe that the same rule applies to them. Their stories are really "out of space," and were it not that their characters used the wireless, one could not place them in any epoch. In other words, they ignore contemporary society, and, with it, certain young people of the post-war generation.

Marcel Arland is not a novelist of this type, and for this reason his work *L'Ordre** is interesting to meet. Though voluminous, it is always lively, but we have to regret, among other things, that there is often a coldness in its lucidity. Apart from two or three characters which are depicted with tenderness, all the people, even the leading characters, are seen in a merciless light.

Our interest in *L'Ordre* is less concerned with the feelings that the characters inspire than with the novel method in which the author handles his theme, a theme which, truth to tell, is by no means new. Since the time of Chateaubriand and Byron the rebellion against social laws, the scorn of the proud unsatisfied youth, vaunting through life his bitterness and indulging in clamorous tirades against the platitudes of respectable people, have been represented a thousand times. All that M. Arland had to do was to take once again the hero of the Romanticist School, strip him of his declamations, and dress him in the fashion of our day. In this the author has quite succeeded. Gilbert is portrayed as sharp, harsh, pitying only himself, mad with vanity and pride, obsessed with the desire to surpass others and the fear of seeming ridiculous, imperious, unsociable. Despite some exaggeration, he is indeed but the inelegant offspring of the pre-Romanticists, an incarnation of revolt resulting from a century of individualism and the unrestrained licence of the years after the war.

But in Romanticism, born of an unreal world, it was the magnificent man, contemptuous of law, whose overdeveloped egotism only recognised himself, that claimed our admiration as his due. That his loves were more noxious than hatred, that he spread around him only ruin and despair, did not matter: draped in a heroic mantle he remained on his pedestal. In a real world things do not happen so. The relations of cause and effect manifest themselves rigorously,

* This work was awarded the Prix Goncourt by the Academie des Goncourts in 1929.

and whosoever makes sport of vital laws must expect to pay the price. In spite of his youth—he belongs to the generation under thirty—M. Arland has seen this; and at the risk of being accused of indulging in the rôle of a moralizer, he does not fear to tell the truth. His hero is mad for independence, and despising a normal life, will not permit any questions regarding the choice of a future career. Deciding to accept only work which would leave him all his liberty, Gilbert runs away to Paris with some hundred francs in his purse. He gains a livelihood by writing for the extreme radical press, and leads in the Latin Quarter the existence of a lawless Bohemian. After many vicissitudes—a duel, an illness, long stagnant periods, more or less unproductive, but interspersed with spasmodic desire for work and dreams of success, Gilbert obtains the love of Justin's wife. He allows her to abandon her home for his sake. In a short time he wearies of her love, and behaves in such a manner that a girl with whom he has resumed former relations, shoots the unfortunate Justin and wounds her severely. But the novelty of the work lies in that the lawless morality, the disregard of standards provocatively emphasised, which according to the law of pure individualism still in vogue among some people ought to put a halo around Gilbert, or at least give strength to his character, M. Arland denounces for their harmfulness and "*cabotinage*." It is enough to marshal the facts in the light of the logic of life, in order to show that bravado and contempt of duty lead nowhere—not even finally to the preservation of illusions concerning oneself. Defeated, but still arrogant and unsociable, Gilbert pursues his wretched life in the Far East and America. He returns at about the age of thirty to his native village to die, having suffered for months from a gnawing cancer—the result of a wound—and for years by the feeling of having been a weakling or more exactly a "*raté*."

"The mark of this generation," his brother once said, "is the unlicensed freedom of the individual, which means the destruction of the social and moral ties, in a word, of all order. And this will be the ruin of the country." After Gilbert's death, musing on his wasted gifts and on the spirit of discipline, he lets fall this remark which sums up precisely the significance of the book: "As if everything is not destined inevitably to return into order." But a final word is also said by the blunt Abbé Leblanc; "Carry on, you young people, specimens of the rottenness of the time, self-conceited, egoistic, mean. Ah! people want to find God elsewhere than in God! God,—the idea is old, out of fashion; moreover it involved sacrifices." There lies the crux of the problem. Order requires an ideal and a renunciation, and there lies the secret of power. But are the egotists willing to listen to this Law of Life?

May, 1930.

A very cultured man once remarked to some Christians who had been discussing the problem of God: "God—I will believe in him when

you show him to me." In his latest book—or rather pamphlet—*The Death of Bourgeois Morals*, M. E. Berl seems to require more evidence even than this. One feels that if God were shown to him, he would doubt the testimony of his senses, since God is included in "bourgeois values" which in his opinion are now dying or dead. To him, what appears living is materialism—materialism which is anathema to the Bourgeois, since it is in no way aristocratic and allies one with the common people. "Between the proletariat and materialism," writes the author, "there is an undeniable alliance. He who eschews materialism betrays the interests of the common people, even more, supports their enemies. Materialism has a way of depreciating values. Depreciation is in a sense involved in it. All the values of real significance that the Bourgeoisie unremittingly establish, materialism rules out of court. Whatever is presented for its consideration as worthy of respect, it views with suspicion; whatever is offered as pure is sceptically received. It makes an attack against respectability and supports it with justification. Its attitude is cynical and it concerns itself only with a frank search after truth, and for it the greatest truth coincides with whatever is least noble in life."

To deny God because one cannot see him, or because to believe in him is the creed of the Bourgeois class, are not reasons worthy of discussion. Let us say, however, in passing, that the second reason is not in accordance with facts. All the common people are not materialists, nor are all the Bourgeois believers in God. The first reason is not in accordance with the scientific mind. Does not Science believe in rational principles, as for instance that of causality, and in imponderable fluids, such as ether? Nevertheless, neither the one nor the other can be apprehended by external perception. But to this the materialist would demur. He would contend that if certain realities are not perceptible by our senses, yet they are manifested by their effects. But where can we find the manifestations of God? The days are no more when from the flower to the insect, from the bird to the star, all seemed order, harmony, and beauty, and when the spectacle of the Universe declared the glory of God. Nature and her cruelties we now know too well to discover a God therein.

Even though Nature seems to obey a directive Law, no one tries to find the God in her. "God reveals Himself in personalities. He does not reveal Himself by things . . . but through men, through consecrated souls." Such manifestations of the living God have existed at different times and in different degrees. M. W. Monod has in his book, *The Cloud of Witnesses*, culled examples from Judaism and Christianity. The first volume deals with the ascent towards Christ—Moses, Isaiah; then Christ Himself, with the Apostle Paul, and the four denunciators of the clergy's decadence—John Chrysostom, Gregory VII, Francis of Assisi and John Huss; the Reformers, and Pascal, the great representative of Jansenism. The second volume treats of Fox, Wesley, and Oberlin, who were the "Reformers of the Reformation," of Neff and A. Monod whose names are connected

with religious revival; of Vinet and Robertson, representative of theological revival; then come Elizabeth Fry and A. Gratry as examples of social revival; W. Booth and R. Coillard, personifications of missionary revival; and finally T. Fallot, whose ecumenical mind aimed at the union of all Christian souls. In conclusion the author expounds his own views on the Church of the future, which must be really "Catholic," that is to say, Universal.

It would be interesting to place side by side the views of M. W. Monod, or those of the authorities which he quotes, and the views which M. Romain Rolland propounds in his two volumes, *The Life of Vivekananda and the Eternal Gospel*. But whether the teachings of the great Hindu are too poetical and mystical, or perhaps for some other reason, one feels that a comparison between them would at best be vague, and even then likely to be contested. Though the heart is captivated by the thought of Vivekananda as it is presented in these volumes, the mind is apt to be confused. Must we give one or two examples? It is said that evil does not exist, that God is in the sin as well as in the sinner, and that his Love directs everything. "Moved by this love Christ gave His life for humanity. . . . And by the same Love—what a strange paradox!—the robber goes to rob, the murderer goes to slay For the moving force is the same. The robber has the love of gold. Love is always there but the direction is evil." To confound the love which kills and the love which saves, is it not to play with words? And if "evil" does not exist, what can be the significance of a love whose direction is "evil"? The only comment that we shall allow ourselves to make on this confusion of ideas is that such ways of thinking are disconcerting. An incontrovertible idea, however, is presented to us. For Vivekananda, "religion is synonymous with universality," and the religious spirit must enlarge and purify itself. "When we arrive at the real, spiritual, and universal concept, then only will religion become living; then only will it penetrate our society, and be infinitely more powerful for good than it has been up till now."

The author of *The Cloud of Witnesses* does not speak otherwise when he protests against the purely ritual religions and aspires to the true Catholicity. Starting from different points, the two bear the same testimony of the God who works in Humanity everywhere to lead it to a universal Spirituality.

M. DUGARD.

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS.

[**H. D. Sethna, M.A.**, is a student of Comparative Philosophy, whose research work has won commendation. Theosophical students will read with interest his remarks about the views of Madame Blavatsky—Eds.]

DURATION AND ETERNITY.*

This is a very useful and entertaining book. The author has taken an exhaustive historical and critical survey of philosophical speculation dealing with the problem, and the very magnitude of his task well done proves his philosophical abilities.

The two traditional explanations of the meaning of time, as Mr. Gunn points out, are the Absolute and the Relational theories, the former having come down to us from the work of Newton and the latter from that of Leibniz. The Absolute theory claims that there is something called time which exists quite apart from events and which is characterised by a succession of separate moments. The Relational theory asserts that it is just a relation born out of succession of events. But both these theories, Mr. Gunn tells us, cannot be held to be valid. To conceive of a something radically separate from the events is to render the relationship between the latter impossible, for if we try to bridge the separation between any two events and that something called time, an infinite number of relations will spring up between these events and time, and the result is that the events will never be connected at all! On the other hand, to conceive of time whose existence wholly consists of being a relation between events, is on the very face of it absurd, for in order that any thing should exist, say the time-relation, it must exist in time, and if that is so, time cannot be the relation only.

Thus the two traditional theories of time cannot be justifiably held. The only method to realise the true nature of time is to understand it as it is actually found in our experience. Kant was the first in Western philosophy to indicate this to us. But, as Mr. Gunn points out, in investigating time as it is found in our experience, philosophers have been led away to identify the latter with the subjective process of thought. This had led even Kant to call Time as the "inner sense" different from what is objectively given to us—Space. Bergson in modern times has followed Kant in calling "duration" as something intimate and subjective as opposed to space. Thus an unreasonable subjective interpretation of time has arisen, but it has been useful in raising two fundamental questions—what is the relation between space and time? and in what can time be regarded as objective?

The Problem of Time.*—An Historical and Critical Study. By **J. ALEXANDER GUNN, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.)

Modern philosophy, by investigating the foundations of our experience, has given to these questions the following answer: Time is the durational passage of experience which underlies both the subject and object in knowledge, and hence it is thoroughly objective. Thus it must be closely inter-related with space which is an objective datum. In this emphasis on the objectivity of time as duration understood in this sense, the two extreme schools of thought, realism under Alexander, Whitehead and Broad, and the neo-idealism under Croce and Gentile, have happily met! But, in thus "taking time seriously" they have asserted that there is nothing which is beyond or underlies time, and hence have made their positions untenable. For, as Mr. Gunn rightly puts it at the end of his book:

The Universe may be spoken of as in Time only if we are speaking of the Universe minus Time. The Whole is manifested or given as a temporal process, and therefore Time, both in its perceptual and its conceptual character, is in the Universe, not the Universe in Time.....The Whole itself (and the values associated with it which are true at any time) is not in Time, and we must regard it, in this sense, as timeless.

In these conclusions of modern philosophy about the nature of time, a student of Theosophy will find great similarity to what is stated by Madame Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*. For instance, she says, "Time is only an illusion produced by the succession of states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration, and it does not exist where no consciousness exists in which the illusion can be produced but 'lies asleep'." Here she puts in striking contrast, as modern philosophy has done, the illusory notion of subjective time and the real time, the "eternal duration." The latter must be inter-related with Space. This is just what Alexander has given us in his conception of Space-Time. Thus, for her as for modern thinkers, time rightly understood is so very real that it is impossible, by any idealistic casuistry, to deny its existence. "Not one will escape the scythe of Time," she emphatically puts it. "Praise the god or gods, or flout one or both, and that scythe will not be made to tremble one millionth of a second in its ascending or descending course!" On the other hand, unlike Alexander and others, she admits the existence of an Eternal Present, the spiritual unity that underlies time, for she says that "the Universe, not only past, present, and future—which is a human and finite idea expressed by finite thought—but in its totality, the Sat (an untranslatable term), the absolute being, with the Past and Future crystallised in an Eternal Present, is that Divine Thought." Thus what Madame Blavatsky has said in 1888 is expressed by philosophers just at the present day. But there is a profundity in her thoughts which does not seem to have been expressed by modern speculation and which may baffle some of the greatest thinkers.

H. D. SETHNA.

Possession: Demoniactal and Other. By Professor T. K. OESTERREICH, translated by D. Ibberson, M.A., (Kegan, Paul London, 21s. net.)

Opening this large and well produced volume with anticipations of interest to be derived from a really modern and up-to-date survey and discussion of the problems suggested by the word "Possession," we were frankly disappointed in regard to any illumination thrown upon the darker places of human psychology. The translator remarks:—"It would be difficult to see the human race in a more fantastic light than that cast by these stories of Possession." This is true, for this volume brings together a large number of extracts describing the phenomena of Possession throughout the ages and, in this relation, "surveys the world from China to Peru." It presents us therefore with a useful compendium of cases, and the translator's further assertion that "the work abounds in suggestions for further research," is also correct in so far as the author implores ethnologists to pay greater attention to psychology. Indeed he makes it a reproach to them that they "seek rather to accumulate facts and describe customs than to offer psychological explanations" (p. 256), a characteristic which in the reviewer's opinion should rather "be accounted unto them for righteousness"! We are not however left long in doubt as to the author's own conclusions, and these may fairly be summed up in his own words (p. 38) "the only adequate explanation of possession is that postulating a simple alteration in the functions of the ordinary subject. The subject presents no division nor does any new ego appear in the organism: these hypotheses are entirely superfluous and are beset with the gravest difficulties. It is one single and identical subject which finds itself now in the normal, now in the abnormal state. . . . If the subject no longer considers himself the same, if he believes, especially from the numerical point of view, that he is another subject and not that he is in another state, this is false and should be considered as a passing delusion." (cf. also pages 46, 54.) Possession, therefore, in the ordinary acceptation of the term is summarily dismissed, although no longer ago than 1892 we had the physician to the Liverpool Psychic Hospital reviving the idea that much apparent lunacy is due to possession by some evil soul, or demon. In a further development (p. 65) the author assures us that "there develops in the psyche a sort of secondary system of personality which directs the person's life against his will. The subject loses control over a considerable number of his states, and it is thus part of his personality which plays the obsessive rôle of a demon." The author's term for this is "parasitic psychic obsessions"!

Stress is laid on the fact that with the progress of knowledge the character of possession changes and with the disappearance of belief in demons the possessive entities describe themselves and are accepted as the souls or spirits of dead persons; and towards the close of the long chapter on "voluntary possession among higher civilisations" there is a brief account of the Piper séances which the Professor dismisses with the words:—"In essentials it recalls numerous others

which we have already met, the somnambulistic personalities pretend to be spirits who have entered into the medium and who have intercourse with other spirits." Nevertheless, in an appendix entitled "Parapsychology," the author admits that the Piper case has altered his views as to the facts of prophecy, clairvoyance and telepathy attributed to the possessed (parapsychic phenomena in his terminology) but he assures us, in all the emphasis of italics, that: "*The acceptance as real of parapsychic phenomena does not, of course, signify any return to the old doctrine of possession.*" Finally the book ends with the words: "The purely negative reply which so greatly facilitated for rationalism the historical criticism of all these accounts is frankly no longer possible to-day."

Some of our readers will turn with interest to the Chapter on Shamanism in North Asiatic peoples, recalling in this connection Mme. Blavatsky's vivid recital of her personal experiences with a Tartar Shaman who acted as guide, and gave her a thrilling experience of his powers. The full account is related in *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, pp. 598 *et seq.*

EDITH WARD.

Our Sixth Sense. By Professor CHARLES RICHEL. Authorised translation by Fred. Rothwell. Illustrated with diagrams. (Rider & Co., London. 7s. 6d. net.)

"Our Sixth Sense," in my opinion, is a work of outstanding value on a subject concerning which books that are worth the trouble of reading are, unfortunately, rare. It is a study of the sixth sense or cryptesthesia, under which term are comprised the phenomena of telepathy on the one hand, and those of lucidity and psychometry, or "pragmatic cryptesthesia" (to use Richet's own term) on the other.

Professor Richet's contention is that there is adequate evidence for believing that the mind possesses powers whereby it may become acquainted with events other than through the medium of the known senses or by means of any conceivable extension of their activities. When this knowledge is derived through the mediation of a second mind, which itself becomes acquainted with the event by the ordinary channels of sensation, the phenomenon is rightly labelled telepathic. There has been a tendency, especially, perhaps in England, to suppose that the telepathic hypothesis is adequate to account for all cases of cryptesthesia. But, whilst Professor Richet by no means denies the actuality of telepathy, he has marshalled in this book instances of cryptesthesia of the "pragmatic" type to which the telepathic hypothesis seems inapplicable.

It needs to be emphasised that the book explains nothing (I have read at least one hostile review of it in which Professor Richet's "explanation" of cryptesthesia has been hotly criticised). Professor Richet has no explanation. His object, as very clearly set out in the

book itself, is not to explain, but to demonstrate the reality of cryptesthesia, or "our sixth sense," by collecting and arranging the experimental data concerning it.

The history of psychical research is rich in premature theories. As bases for further experiment, hypotheses are useful; but still more useful is it to know the facts; and the facts concerning cryptesthesia are here.

Naturally, Professor Richet has had to make a choice, and, again, naturally, his choice is open to criticism. The experiments with Reese and Kahn, for example, are suspect. The *modus operandi* of these mediums resembles too closely that of stage illusionists. Professor Richet, of course, is well acquainted with the common methods adopted for reading a series of unknown messages or selected cards and appears adequately to have guarded against their adoption in his experiments with Kahn, though other instances of cryptesthesia which he relates, such, for example, as those occurring in the case of Ossevietski, are of a much more convincing character. These well-attested cases serve to point the way for further experimentation, which, in this domain, at any rate, is the one thing most needed.

H. S. REDGROVE.

[While Prof. Richet supplies data, Theosophy explains the meaning and *modus operandi* of all abnormal phenomena. We may draw our readers' attention to Chapters 16 and 17 of *The Ocean of Theosophy*, and to the closing Chapters of Vol. II of *Isis Unveiled*; the latter book is full of data and explanations of a variety of psychical phenomena.—EDS.]

Blake and Modern Thought.—By DENIS SAURAT. (Constable and Co., Ltd., London. 14s.)

The thought of the present day is marked by an ever-increasing interest in things "occult." Although in many instances this interest rises no higher than the plane of psychic phenomena or the field of the sub-conscious mind, it sometimes resolves itself into a patient search for what Browning calls "the secret of the world; of man and man's true purpose, path and fate." This growing search for the answer to the riddle of the universe is causing many of the philosophical systems of the ancients to be re-investigated, and is bringing the works of many mediæval and modern Occultists again to the light of day.

A noteworthy contribution along these lines has recently been made by Dr. Denis Saurat, who is Head of the French Institute in England, Doctor of the Sorbonne and a Professor in the University of London. His latest book *Blake and Modern Thought* contains a series of parallelisms in which the occult theories of William Blake are contrasted and compared with those of the ancient schools as well as his own contemporaries. In this volume Dr. Saurat temporarily

lays aside his interest in Blake the *man* and centres his whole attention upon Blake the *Occultist* and those "fantasies of his peculiar thought" which his biographers for the most part have failed to explain.

Fortunately for his readers, Dr. Saurat has not fallen into the pitfall of confusing Occultism with those various and sundry flights of fancy which so often pose under that name. He considers Occultism as the storehouse of the ancient traditions, and values it because of its power to keep alive, under some prevailing philosophy or religion, many of the elements of deep thought which have been neglected by conventional thinking.

In summarizing the occult traditions of the different historical periods, Dr. Saurat finds the greatest Occultists in the 17th century, when Robert Fludd in England, Jacob Boehme in Germany and later Henry More and his friend von Rosenroth lifted Occultism into a high and ordered philosophy. The work of 18th century Occultists he finds trifling in comparison. He says: "You have to come, later in the 19th century to Eliphas Levi and H. P. Blavatsky to find greatness in Occultism."

Dr. Saurat considers the *Zohar* as the greatest encyclopædia of Occultism in existence, and offers the opinion that Madame Blavatsky derived most of her Occult theories from it. If it is not the source, he says, it can at least be used as a *witness*. Any one who has studied the works of H. P. Blavatsky knows that she used not only the *Zohar* but thousands of other books as "witnesses" of her statements. She never made any claim for originality in the works that she published, but used the words of Montaigne to define her position: "I have here made only a nosegay of culled flowers, and have brought nothing of my own but the string that ties them."

In his own way, Dr. Saurat has done the same thing. He has culled a nosegay of the ancient doctrines, added some flowers of mediæval and modern thought, and tied them all together with the string furnished by William Blake.

Dr. Saurat considers Blake as one of the greatest Occultists not only of his own century, but of all times. He finds Blake's particular genius in his ability to fuse all schools into one and to interpret them into a system which is alive with bold and profound ideas. This power, or desire, of synthesis makes Blake's work peculiarly useful to the present age. Every lover of Blake will feel grateful to Dr. Saurat for his scholarly work.

L. H.

Earth, by FRANK TOWNSHEND. (Alfred A. Knopf, London. Price 6s.)

This is a record of an acute observer of life, cast in poetical form. It is divided into four sections: The Earth; Vision of the Earth; Life; The Story of the Earth, and once one has begun to read the

book it is difficult to put it down, for there are many good things in it. One's attention is arrested by such striking contrasts as the following :

Some men collected silver and glass and Japanese prints,
Because they liked them ;
While others collected bottles and rags and cigarette ends,
To make a living.

But despite all these anomalies in life, Mr. Townshend feels that in reality all is for the best, and that it will all come right in the end ; and so we have his vision of the earth as "an earth that is alive—glowing with the care of man ; man grown wise and free."

On closer inspection we find the vision of the earth that is to be disappointingly materialistic, but Mr. Townshend assures us :

The vision of the earth as it will be, is truth as I know it ;
It lives in my heart, and one day it will live in the heart of the world.
That, to my knowledge is certain.

This is a tremendous claim, and we are told that people have come to the author and said :

We believe in the earth of your vision ; what can we do to hasten the
day of its coming ?

I answered :

That day cannot be hastened by any external thing ;
By any institution, or government, or system ;
Its coming depends upon an awakening in the mind of man.
The only mind which you can awaken is your own ;
And the way of that awakening is the way of life.

It is perfectly true that the minds of men have to be changed, but Mr. Townshend does not tell us how. Whatever his real understanding be (and he tells us that while walking in an Eastern city suddenly he knew "the workings of the Universe ; knew my place in it ; that I was immortal"), he cannot direct us. He tells us :

I draw my understanding from the same source as that from which Lao-tse and Buddha and Christ and Mohammed drew theirs ;
And I know it.

But the Great Teachers made such practical use of Their knowledge that Their effect is felt in the present day. *Earth* is, a delightful book, and well worth reading ; but—something is missing.

F. E.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CHRISTMAS COMPASSION.

Having read with great interest Mr. H. S. Salt's article in the March number of *THE ARYAN PATH*, I would like to recount to your readers an incident of my own experience which forcibly illustrates the evil effect that the slaughter of helpless animals before young children may have upon the undeveloped mind.

Chatting one day soon after the Christmas festival with youngsters from a cottage home, I asked them what they had had for their Christmas dinner, and was told they had eaten one of the two tame ducks that had been used to wander in and out of their parlour door, and had seemed to be pets of the family.

This was bad enough, but worse was to follow. Ere I could reply, one of the boys excitedly exclaimed: "And I saw Mr. W—cut off its head with a big knife, and the red blood came!" Then turning to the girl beside him, he continued: "And when I grow to be a man, I'm going to cut off *your* head with a big knife, *and see the red blood come!*"

Comment is superfluous, yet I must add that those who advocate the custom of "bleeding" young "sportsmen," are incurring grave responsibilities. "It must be that offences come, but woe unto that man through whom the offence cometh."

Malvern, England.

TOM LEON.

PARACELSUS.

All those who have been sufficiently interested to imbibe the contents of Dr. Aschner's article on Paracelsus in the April number, whether medical or lay, will acknowledge the debt due to him for accentuating the fact of the failure of present day medicine to cure "the ills that flesh is heir to." However, in spite of all that Dr. Aschner reveals to us, his article is unfinished.....In alluding to Paracelsus as a pioneer of medical science, he has failed to accentuate also the fact that "the medicine of Paracelsus deals not only with the external body of man, which belongs to the world of effects, but more especially with the inner man and the world of causes, never leaving out of sight the Universal Presence of the Divine cause in all things. His medicine is, therefore, a holy science, and its practice a sacred mission, such as cannot be understood by those who are godless; neither can Divine power be conferred by diplomas and academical degrees."

This statement of Dr. Franz Hartmann does not sound as if "Paracelsus was first and foremost a doctor and an alchemist and

secondly, a mystic philosopher" as Dr. Aschner would have us believe.

Perhaps Dr. Aschner is afeared of the voice of the medical world of to-day, who would label him a quack if he should admit the spiritual basis of the practice of medicine. Was not Paracelsus labelled a "charlatan" by a majority of medical dunderheads in the 16th century?

London.

ESTELLE COLE.

A RELIGIOUS ANIMAL.

In your June number O. Muiriel-Fuller says (p. 407) that "Man is a religious animal." Does the instinct to follow a religious creed reside in the lower or animal nature of man? Then logically the institution of religion panders to the lower in us and therefore must originate from the dark side of Nature.

Darjeeling.

A. M. T.

[Religion does not emanate from the dark side of nature, but religions do. Every creed, with its claims, is a separative force, hence its power to do mischief is greater than its capacity to do good. Every religion panders to some human vanity—"chosen people," "special way," "unique prophet," etc., etc., which debase Truth. A Great Master has said that two-thirds of the evil in the human kingdom arises from religious persuasions and practices. Theosophy teaches that man needs no priests, for each soul has to become a priest unto himself; he requires no sectarian church which glorifies one prophet or one holy book at the expense of or to the detriment of others, for all true Prophets should be objects of our veneration, and all Holy Writ subjects of our study. All great religions are at their source and bottom united and right; all of them, without exception, are wrong in their physical manifestations, and on the surface. He who follows a particular creed and is influenced by its priests, does so from animal instincts rooted in his own lower nature. He who consults his own soul finds that enlightenment of mind and freedom from passion are not the gifts of religions. Religions, one and all, are followed by our animal nature; Religion, and there is only one and that indivisible, is lived by the power of soul-intuitions—whisperings of Buddhi to Manas. We advise our correspondent and all readers to study *Is Theosophy a Religion?* by H. P. Blavatsky, now available in pamphlet form.—Eds.]

INDIA'S KARMA.

I read and re-read Mr. T. L. Crombie's article "India's Freedom" and Mr. Rajagopalachari's Note in your March number and also the Rejoinder in the April number.

First, a word about your ability and ardent desire to contribute to the progress of India—a desire which is reflected in every number of THE ARYAN PATH and which prompts me to respond to the invitation to discuss the ideas expressed in the above articles.

The case of India is that of an organism weakened by an excessive organization which hinders individual initiative. Political evil is the result of social evil, and Mr. Rajagopalachari concedes this proposition when he says that "our weakness and our present condition are no doubt the result of past deeds and omissions. The Karma of individuals makes up the Karma of the nation too." Further, he has well observed that "Karma is not a philosophy of idleness. Action is the sovereign remedy for all ills." Now the question is: What kind of action? If political slavery be the result of national wrong, mostly social, how can mere political action remedy the evil? If past deeds have produced our present weakness, it is natural and logical that we should do opposite deeds which make us strong. What kind? Freedom for the individual—man and woman—especially for the woman; freedom for the untouchable, the low caste; freedom for the *social* Indian—this is essential. The individual, born and bred up in slavery in the home, cannot really become free in the State. Since woman became a slave, true duty (dharma) disappeared from India.

I disagree with Mr. Crombie when he asks if India wants to be nationalist, while Europe goes toward internationalism. Europe has passed through nationalism and India will have to pass through it. Internationalism can only be understood among free nations, and not between masters and slaves. Colonisation and mandates represent the remains of ancient slavery. What is to be done at the present moment? I think we must not give up political activities already begun, but at the same moment we must strive harder and with even greater intensity in social matters, *proclaiming the equality of all castes and creeds as the first step to the free intercourse among individuals*. Mass education is the lever that impels the people to progress, provokes political and economical emancipation; for without trained workmen and honest citizens there is neither industry nor national government. To THE ARYAN PATH belongs the work of concentrating efforts in order that social reform be conducted in the light of Ancient Wisdom whose first doctrine is Universal Brotherhood.

New Goa.

P. L. B.

[Our correspondent is a professor in a Medical College in Portuguese India which, he tells us, is not different to any degree from British India. Further, he applies the law of analogy to India's ill-health—ill-health caused by microbes which attack the body in which "organic resistance is lessened." In his view, the causal microbes are mainly social.—EDS.]

KARMA OF CHILDREN.

Your May leading article "The March of the Soul" ends, "How many such souls will this march produce?" and the souls you envisage are the Impersonal ones, the lovers and servers of humanity.

It is more particularly this ending which has raised a thought in my mind—What *effect* will this march, or any other strongly organized public disobedience to the laws of a land have upon Souls, and especially upon the Souls of children and young people?

In my thought it does not matter whether the cause of the movement is just, as far as justice goes, or what its aim; what does matter is its effect on youth and innocence, so easily influenced by emotion and sentiment.

Millions of children have been caused suffering through the acts, however apparently worthy, of their parents in international and internecine strife, and the worst of these sufferings have been by no means simple neglect or even starvation and death, but the far deeper and more permanent shock to their souls. Always indeed will the children be the worst sufferers in these affairs.

My two younger children of 7 and 9 years belong to a Society, whose object is international child service and which has many members. These two children have, the one an adopted little sister in Budapesth, the other a brother in Constantinople. They write each other affectionate letters and send each other presents, and the adopted children being very poor are helped a little with money by mine, who are not so poor.

If I had another small child I would like more than anything else in the world that he should have an adopted sister or brother in India. But what a danger there would be of the sudden and tragic breaking of the sweet friendship when the father in India might, to satisfy his trust in his leader, suddenly curse all things English and cause the child to do so, in all loyalty and obedience.

I am sure many will agree with me that, although this is the Iron Age, it is also the Age of spiritual regeneration, with which our children may have much to do, and will join with me in begging each master of men, and Mahatma Gandhi in particular, because of his great power in a land whose innate wisdom in the spiritual conquest of self stands unrivalled, to consider the effect of their respective acts and words on our precious youth.

Canea, Crete.

F. J. WATSON-TAYLOR.

ENDS AND SAYINGS.

“_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers.”

HUDIBRAS.

In the June *Atlantic Monthly* the veteran scientist, J. Arthur Thomson, contributes a remarkable article on “The New World of Science.” It is a masterly review of past achievements, fair to the dead materialism which, he says, “was largely a superstition,” and which in the last decades of the nineteenth century was in fashion. He also records the death of “the old view of science as a kind of bed-rock knowledge which has the last word to say about everything, the one and only right way to reality. Science has no such exalted métier.” In reading this record we are able to see the theosophizing of the scientist’s attitude ; and the humble admission that “science is a particular way of looking at the world, but it is not the only way,” reveals once again the greatness of mind of a true scientist. Professor Thomson rightly takes credit for the gifts science has made to mankind, but cautions his readers that what science deals with “are What, Whence, How. But it declines to ask the question Why ? For it is not its business—that is, not in the line of its methods of descriptive analysis—to inquire into the purpose or significance of the evolving world as a whole.” He concedes that that pertains to the domain of “philosophy and religion.”

The world needs a religious philosophy which is capable of accepting the proven facts of science, explaining the lacunæ in scientific theories and helping on the work of progressing and progressive science. Philosophy, religion and science must unite to produce a body of *knowledge* which will satisfy the mind, the soul and the body of man. Modern science is the natural ally of Theosophy though this may not be conceded ; modern religions cannot but be unfriendly to Theosophy, though this may sound strange ; modern philosophy has too restricted a field of speculation and its contact with the life of the masses is almost non-existent, while Theosophy deals with the whole man from spiritual to material, in a practical way, though this may not be accepted by non-Theosophists. Theosophy is the synthesis of science, religion and philosophy and has something to offer to each of the three branches of knowledge.

It is interesting to note, however, that some eminent men do not quite like the idea of scientific isolation, and its divorce from philosophy. Professor F. G. Donnan of University College, London,

apparently speaks for them in *Nature* of 7th June. He suggests the holding of

an international conference among poets, philosophers, psychologists, biologists, mathematicians, physicists and chemists who should be brought together to elucidate and discuss the fundamental problems on the nature and meaning of science and its relation to philosophy and to our ordinary concepts of the familiar world. There is an urgent need to bring such men together and to do something towards a synthesis of thought and the advancement of a true *philosophie scientifique*.

The leading thinkers of every country recognize the present-day "unsatisfactory and dangerous position with respect to religion, philosophy and the sciences." The words in quotation marks are taken from the prospectus of the International Philosophic Society, organized by the well known German philosopher, Dr. Raymund Schmidt. Dr. Schmidt is an experienced editor and is about to merge his *Annalen der Philosophie* (one of Germany's leading Philosophical magazines) with a new venture, the *Forum Philosophicum*, henceforth to be the official organ of the new Society. "Editorial members" include such well known names as those of Professor John Dewey, Professor William MacDougall, Einstein, and Professor L. Levy-Bruhl. A member writes us:

It does not necessarily follow that the "editorial members" of the International Society will play active parts in the work of the local branches. It is desired, in so far as the local branches are concerned, to encourage philosophic understanding among "amateurs" and not to engage too much in professionalism—that at least being the present desire of the New York branch, though each branch has full autonomy in evolving its methods and purposes.

But the general principles of the Society must of course permeate the life of every branch. These purposes are:—

....active, international co-operation of the leaders of all cultural nations, in philosophy, religion, economics, education and allied realms of thought; the correlation of Philosophy with Life so that philosophers may be brought into closer relations with the problems of present-day humanity; the study, logical and psychological, of Conscience as the underlying basis of scientific, economic and political progress, and the ushering of this truth into the foreground of human interest.

We wish that such a movement consciously realized the basis of the Eternal Wisdom from which to act and organize. Then indeed would the spiritual welfare of the world be sped on.

"Plain Words About Parenthood," a series of six articles in the London *Evening Standard* from May 14th to 21st, provides an illuminating study of our age in England. According to Dean Inge, who writes about women's revolt against domestic drudgery, marriage is not declining though divorce is increasing and the practice of birth-control spreading—because rough manual labour is being superseded and families are becoming small. Dr. C. V. Drysdale holds that "true" patriotism and "true" humanity impel us to discourage

the further reproduction of the poor and defective types and encourage larger families among the independent classes. (Incidentally his Malthusian argument is strangely contradictory. He declares it is "a mathematical certainty" that without restriction England's population will increase fifty-fold and in a single century exceed the world's present population, yet he also says that from the Norman Conquest to the beginning of the 19th century when families were large, *i.e.* unrestricted, the population only rose from two to nine millions). Mrs. Charlotte Haldane believes that men are rejecting paternity because they want leisure, amusements, and money for other things. Children mean the making of sacrifices and the shouldering of responsibility and to-day's rejection is a sign of the loosening of spiritual bonds. Miss Cathleen Nesbitt (Mrs. Cecil Ramage) differs somewhat from Dean Inge and Aldous Huxley as to the small family, in so far as she thinks young wives want babies and the present is beginning to make them fashionable. Apparently "fashion" will ensure the making of sacrifices and the shouldering of responsibilities. J. D. Beresford pities the childless because children, by bringing to human beings the finest and most unselfish love of which they are capable, mean the greatest joy life has to offer. Aldous Huxley thinks the family no longer an institution but a problem, and "there seems to be no doubt that the family is on the decline."

Behind the words of Mrs. Haldane, Mrs. Ramage, Mr. Beresford and Mr. Huxley are ideas well worth exploration, for they are akin to those of happy Aryan ages when marriage and the family life were deeply comprehended. Family life does wax and wane under inevitable cyclic law. To-day sees its waning, and the waning of spirituality; but "fashion" can make a rising cycle—the thoughts of but one person turned in the right direction can influence those immediately around and radiate outwards in ever-widening circles. So closely interwoven are the world of spirit-thought and the world of material-action, that the loosening of spiritual bonds means neglect of mundane duties—and poverty. Conversely, the shouldering of responsibilities co-ordinates the spiritual and the physical man—probably giving prosperity. It is through family life, completely and truly lived, and the sacrifices made by unselfish love, which in return bring the greatest joy life offers to human beings, that the way to the higher life is opened. Do not all evils, whether from psychological or economic causes, come as we betray our spiritual nature? We forget the Soul within us which alone inspires the life of love and altruism? Its frustration is spiritual birth-control which reflects itself in the material world in the use of contraceptives.

In this, as in so many other problems, the rules of the ancient Aryans may be profitably studied. A two-fold conception of marriage is laid down in the ancient Codes: the first, a sacred and religious contract to fulfil family duties, and to give the world children who would become servers of humanity. It has been said that if the example of true living of the family-life in but one household were imprinted on the tablet of the unseen universe, an age of light would

dawn. The second type of marriage was an undertaking between a man and woman who in past incarnations had worked out their family obligations and so became celibate husband and wife to fit themselves for the life of practical Occultism—the world their home and humanity their family.

It is natural that since the world is plunged in materialism, superstition and selfishness, the doctrine of birth-control should gain an easy hearing. But the tide may be turning, for there are several signs of protest and adverse criticism against the movement from responsible bodies. In one sense it is unfortunate that among the opponents of birth-control are most religious bodies, especially the Roman Catholic Church—as, with the thoughtful, everything strongly sponsored by Churches is viewed with suspicion. Therefore it is encouraging to find that there exists The League of National Life (reported to be non-political and non-sectarian), the object of which is “to combat the theory and practice of contraception.” We are told:—

The attitude of the League is strictly scientific and its arguments are based on the principles of ethical and biological science. Its view is that the practice of contraception is opposed to the principles of scientific ethics and to psychology and physiology. The members of the League who are interested in the several sciences are thus able to bring their own specific contribution, and it is now being found that evidence favourable to the conclusions which have been reached by the League is being supplied by those who have to do with the propaganda of birth-control and with the management of the clinics.

Any organization to stop this most unspiritual and degrading of practices must be welcomed. The appeal the League of National Life is making is an appeal to science, an appeal born of an inner conviction that birth-control is a crime. It is producing *material* reasons against contraception, hoping thus to dissuade a material and selfish world. However, one cannot be very sanguine of the results. What is really required is a spiritual basis for action, a right understanding of what man really is, of the Laws of Karma and Reincarnation. Meanwhile the world goes on its path of destruction unheeding.

The possibility of using the pineal gland as an aid to the comprehension of the “fourth dimension” is being studied by Mr. Carnegie Wilson Pullen, an efficiency engineer of the Western Electric Company in Kearney, New Jersey. Mr. Pullen’s theory closely approaches that of Descartes who regarded the pineal gland as *the seat of the soul*. Mr. Pullen, who is leaving shortly for France to discuss his theories with the great French psychologist Henri Bergson, regards this gland as an active unit rather than an atrophied organ, and is convinced that, if his theory can be proved, the development of the gland will

revolutionize human thought and open up an entirely new world. He says (*New York Times*, April 20, 1930):

The pineal eye may help us to obtain a pyramidal quadrangulation, virtually a "new slant" on things which might translate to us a sense of the fourth dimension. Duration, the individual's perspective of time, is a sense impression possible only for a brain equipped with this peculiar "inner eye." The fourth dimension, psychologically, is a sense of duration, just as the three dimensional sense is one of distance.

There is enough evidence available to give more than a suggestion that some of the early races of mankind were "three-eyed." The three-eyed Colossus on the Acropolis of Argos, the expression of Hindu mystics when speaking of the "eye of Siva," the references to the third eye found in Chaldean fragments and in the "Bamboo Books" of ancient China—all of these point to the existence of a former Cyclopean race which possessed a third organ of sight which was connected with spiritual, rather than with purely physical vision. Says an Ancient Commentary:—

There were four-armed human creatures in those early days of the male-females (hermaphrodites); with one head, yet three eyes. They could see before them and behind them. A KALPA later (after the separation of the sexes) men having fallen into matter, their spiritual vision became dim; and co-ordinately the third eye commenced to lose its power When the Fourth (Race) arrived at its middle age, the inner vision had to be awakened, and acquired by artificial stimuli, the process of which was known to the old sages. The third eye, likewise, getting gradually PETRIFIED soon disappeared. The double-faced became the one-faced, and the eye was drawn deep into the head and is now buried under the hair. During the activity of the inner man (during trances and spiritual visions) the eye swells and expands. The Arhat sees and feels it, and regulates his action accordingly. The undefiled Lanoo (disciple, chela) need fear no danger; he who keeps himself not in purity (who is not chaste) will receive no help from the "deva eye."

This is taken from the *Secret Doctrine* (II, 294-295) by H. P. Blavatsky who commenting upon it says:—

Unfortunately not. The "deva-eye" exists no more for the majority of mankind. *The third eye is dead*, and acts no longer; but it has left behind a witness to its existence. This witness is now the PINEAL GLAND. The allegorical expression of the Hindu mystics when speaking of the "eye of Siva," the *Tri-lochana* ("three-eyed"), thus received its justification and *raison d'être*—the transference of the PINEAL GLAND (once that "third eye") to the forehead, being an exoteric licence. This throws also light on the mystery incomprehensible to some of the connection between *abnormal*, or Spiritual Seership, and the physiological purity of the Seer. The question is often asked, "Why should celibacy and chastity be a *sine qua non* rule and condition of regular *chelaship*, or the development of psychic and occult powers?" The answer is contained in the *Commentary*.

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road,
BOMBAY.

CONTENTS

FORMER ARTICLES.

- CONCERNING THE TITLE "THE ARYAN PATH."—
By Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson (New York).
THE LEAGUE'S TENTH BIRTHDAY.—*By the Rt. Hon. Lord Parmoor, P.C., K.C.V.O.*
THUS HAVE I HEARD.—*By Shravaka.*
THE CONSTRUCTIVE SIDE OF BUDDHISM.—*By M. G. Mori (Japan).*
ON REINCARNATION.—*By Algernon Blackwood.*
SOME MORAL ASPECTS OF THE COLOUR BAR.—*By Lord Olivier.*
THE DIGNITY OF LABOUR.—*By Hon. James J. Davis.*
THE BARBARITY OF BLOOD SPORTS.—*By Henry S. Salt.*
PERSIAN ISLAMIC MYSTICISM.—*By Margaret Smith.*
WHAT HURTS LIBERALISM IN EUROPE.—*By N. B. Parulekar.*
WHERE EAST AND WEST MEET.—*By A. N. M.*
THE NEXT RENAISSANCE.—*By A. R. Orage.*
THE INNER LIFE OF SOCIALISM.—*By G. D. H. Cole.*
THE SPIRIT OF INQUIETUDE.—*By M. Dugard.*
RELIGIOUS TENDENCY IN JAPAN.—*By Prof. E. E. Speight.*
MAN VERSUS NATIONALISM.—*By Norman Angell.*
THE OLD DOCTRINE OF MAYA AND MODERN SCIENCE.—*By Ivor B. Hart, O.B.E., Ph.D.*
CIVILISATION.—*By C. Delisle Burns.*
TOWARDS A RECOVERY OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.—
By Irwin Edman.
PARACELUS AS PIONEER OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.—
By Dr. Bernard Aschner.
IS UNIVERSAL PEACE PRACTICABLE?—*By Raja J. P. Bahadur Singh.*
PROSPICE ET RESPICE.—*By Prof. A. R. Wadia.*
INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY.—*By C. E. M. Joad.*
THE EXAMPLE OF DENMARK.—*By Francis Perrot.*
THE MESSAGE OF THE HEROES.—*By John Middleton Murry.*
THE VEDIC PATH.—*By Prof. S. V. Venkateshwara.*
THE INDIA CONCEPTION OF GOD.—*By Prof. Sten Konow.*
WILL WEST MEET EAST.—*By Prof. Paul E. Johnson.*
GOD GEOMETRIZES.—*By E. Hughes-Gibb.*
MUHARRAM.—*By N. Kasturi Iyer.*

OUR LAST NUMBER.

- MASTERS IN DAILY LIVING.
PARABRAHMAN, THE ABSOLUTE—IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.—*By G. R. Malkani.*
DEMOCRACY AND CULTURE.—*By Dr. L. P. Jacks.*
IS A NEW RELIGION EMERGING?—*By D. L. Murray.*
THREE BASIC IDEAS.—*By H. P. Blavatsky.*
LET US STUDY DEATH.—*By Faquir.*
CONTACTING THE INVISIBLE.
THE BOOK FOR HUMANITY.—*By G. V. Ketkar.*
PEACE IDEALS AND THE HEART OF A CHILD.—
By Jeannette Wallace Emrich.
THE UNBRIDLED TONGUE.—*By B.M.*
SCIENCE AND RELIGION.—*By J. D. Beresford.*
THE UNCHANGING EAST.—*By K. S. Shelvankar.*
IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS.—*By Margaret Thomas, Lionel Giles, Margaret Smith, and others.*
CORRESPONDENCE.
ENDS & SAYINGS.

- THE CULTURAL VALUE OF FAIRY STORIES.—*By Erica Fay.*
HINDU CULTURE: ITS MISSION TO THE WEST.—
By Prof. S. F. Darwin Fox.
IS THERE A CYCLIC RISE AND FALL IN HUMAN HISTORY?—*By Dr. Hans Kohn.*
THE WORKER AND THE MACHINE.—*By Hendrik de Man.*
DREAMS IN THE WESTERN WORLD.—*By R. L. Mégroz.*
THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE.—*By Odette Tchernine.*
THE OCCULT IN THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE.—
By C. J. S. Thompson.
VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION.—*By Geoffrey West.*
STRAY THOUGHTS ON THE AGE OF SHANKARACHARYA.—*By Savailal I. Pandya.*
ON KABIR.—*By Prof. E. E. Speight.*
IS IGNORANCE EVER BLISS?—*By Joseph Gaer.*
THE PATH OF THE SOUL AS TAUGHT BY JESUS.—
By Alexander Haggerty Krappe.

Per Annum—Rs. 10 India ; £1 Europe ; \$ 5 America.
Single Copy—Re. 1 India ; 2s. 6d. Europe ; 50 cents America.
Europe—Theosophy Co., Ltd., 293, Regent Street, London, W. 1.
America—Theosophy Co., 245, West 33rd Street, Los Angeles.
America—Theosophy Co., 1, West 67th Street, New York.

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

Being Chosen Fragments

From

“The Book of the Golden Precepts”

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

Fragment I	The Voice of the Silence.
Fragment II	The Two Paths.
Fragment III	The Seven Portals.

This little book is invaluable for those who are trying to tread the Spiritual Way. Madame Blavatsky translated the Precepts from one of the works put into the hands of mystic students in the East. The knowledge of them is obligatory in that School. The book is “dedicated to the few,” but all can profit, if they will energize themselves to practise the Precepts.

Cloth Bound.

Price As. 8.

U. L. T. PAMPHLET SERIES

A long-felt want is being supplied by the publication of old magazine articles by reliable Theosophical writers. These valuable contributions to the study of Theosophy have long been inaccessible to the public, and are now being brought out in pamphlet series at the lowest possible cost to the purchaser :

1. Is Theosophy a Religion *H. P. Blavatsky.*
2. What Theosophy Is *H. P. Blavatsky.*
3. Universal Applications of the
Doctrines, and the Synthesis
of Occult Science *W. Q. Judge.*
4. Castes in India *Damodar K. Mavalankar.*
5. Theosophy Generally Stated *W. Q. Judge.*

Price: Each Anna 1, or 2d. or 5 cents.

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA), LTD.,
51, Esplanade Road, BOMBAY.

Europe—Theosophy Co., Ltd., 293, Regent St., London, W. I.
America—Theosophy Co., 245, West 33rd Street, Los Angeles.
America—Theosophy Co., 1, West 67th Street, New York.